

A REVIEW

OF A

LETTER FROM THE REV. W. SEWELL, A.M.

PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

TO

THE REV. DR. PUSEY:

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

REMARKS ON MR. SEWELL'S TREATISE

ON CHRISTIAN MORALS,

AND ALSO ON AN ARTICLE, ATTRIBUTED TO HIM,

ENTITLED "ROMANISM IN IRELAND,"

WHICH APPEARED IN A LATE NUMBER OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

BY W. THORPE, D.D.

MINISTER OF BELGRAVE CHAPEL.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1841.

LONDON :

IBOTSON AND PALMER, PRINTERS, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

A R E V I E W,

&c.

ON reading Mr. Sewell's letter, the question naturally arises in one's mind, Why did he publish it? what does he mean by it? He informs Dr. Pusey that, "as several individuals had given their opinions of the tract No. 90, he thought it advisable to do as others had done, and not to leave Dr. P. to learn his sentiments from common report." This may be a very good reason for making a verbal communication to Dr. P., or, perhaps, even for *writing* a letter to him; but it is no reason at all for publishing that letter. The publication is rendered the more extraordinary by Mr. Sewell's own statement in another part of it. He had never been, he says, "in the slightest degree connected with the publication of the Oxford Tracts; and he had always studiously avoided habits of intimacy with their authors." If the state of the case has been

exactly as Mr. S. described it, then assuredly he might have spared himself "the anxiety and labour of engaging in such a discussion." An attentive examination, however, of his letters will show, that Mr. S., who seems very well to understand his position, had substantial reasons for his publication. This gentleman is at present before the public as the reputed writer of two papers in the "Quarterly Review" on a politico-religious question connected with the state of Ireland. Let the political part of those papers be put out of sight. It has nothing to do with this subject, which is purely a religious one. It may, however, without any political allusion, be remarked, in passing, that the Tract writers and their abettors, whose religion is part and parcel of Popery, are, as politicians, the most violent opponents of Roman Catholics. They have no idea of the system of reciprocity. They take all, and give nothing. While they eagerly borrow their religion from the Roman Catholics, they pertinaciously retain the state and all its advantages for themselves. In the paper in question Mr. S. paints Popery as it exists and works in Ireland, and the designs and conduct of her priests, in the blackest colours. It, therefore, would not answer his purpose, just at the moment when he has described Popery as so pernicious a system, to have a suspicion raised in the public mind, that he is himself infected with its poison, and that he has, in fact, put forth in detail, and ad-

vocated, several of its most distinctive and worst dogmas. There is strong reason to suspect that it was chiefly to guard against this danger that he has published his letter to Dr. P. Hear what he says himself:—"If I have ever maintained similar principles with the Tracts, it has been so far only as I believed them to be the principles of the Church of England." (All the Tract writers will say the same.) "And I have endeavoured to act independently, only desirous of guarding truth." Again, "My name has been most improperly connected with them"—i. e., the Tracts. Now here the secret is let out. Mr. S. inadvertently acknowledges, that he has maintained similar principles with the Tracts, and that his name has been connected with them. In fact, it appears that the only difference between him and the Tract writers is, that they have acted unitedly and in concert, while he has avoided intimacy with them, and acted independently. The advantage of this course is obvious. A double portion of any popularity or benefit, arising from the new doctrines, would be likely, from the circumstance of his standing alone, without co-partnership, to alight on his head; while any share of responsibility and odium resulting from failure, might, with a little adroitness, be readily avoided. But, able and skilful a man as Mr. S. is, he has overshot the mark; and his letter, the object of which is to separate him from the Tract writers, will serve to mix him up and

identify him with some of their worst errors. The object of his publication being thus made apparent by his own inadvertent admission, the proof of his adhesion to some of the worst errors of the Oxford Tracts is now to be adduced.

It may be necessary to remark that this gentleman's religious principles would be of no consequence to any one except himself, but for two circumstances: 1st, that he is Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College; and 2ndly, that he has recently assumed the office of religious champion in Ireland. In the former capacity he has sent forth a treatise consisting of a mixture of maxims, extracted from the old Greek philosophers, and of Christian ordinances, adulterated by Popish superstitions, which compound he has, facetiously, styled "CHRISTIAN MORALS." In the latter capacity he has placed in review before him the proceedings and condition, past and present, of the Irish clergy, and, with all the airs of an accomplished judge, has pronounced a decision upon them. From the politics which are intermixed with this latter subject, I shall carefully withdraw myself; at the same time, I make no objection to Mr. S.'s intermixing the two subjects. Indeed, it must be confessed that, in Irish affairs, religion and politics are so closely connected, that it is difficult to discuss the one without the introduction of the other. To political discussion, however, I feel more and

more indisposed every day ; being increasingly convinced that it is “ by manifestation of divine truth ” that we are most likely at once to “ approve ourselves to men’s conscience in the sight of God,” and to promote the advancement of true religion within the sphere of our influence. It is, at the same time, due to others, and especially to some who are deserving of the highest regard, to acknowledge that there are situations which seem to justify, if not to call for, a different course. I presume not to dictate the line of duty to others ; nor should I have adverted to this subject, but from an anxiety to separate myself entirely from the political matters contained in the article to which some of my remarks relate.

Now for the proofs that Mr. Sewell is a thorough Oxford Tract divine, and that his principles, like those of the Tracts, are Anti-scriptural and Popish.

Let us examine, first, his language respecting the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church. “ That the Articles,” he says, “ were not intended as a body of dogmatical (*i. e.* authoritative) teaching, but as marks set upon certain existing errors, to warn us against them, leaving the whole space between them free and open, would appear to be an obvious fact.” Again : “ To treat the Articles as a regular system of theology, or to erect such a system, and impose its reception by authority, would probably be a serious evil.”

Is it in such a manner as this, that a fair and

honest man, like Mr. Sewell, should express himself concerning the Articles of the Church? He asserts that they were not intended as a body of authoritative teaching. Let any man read one or more of the Articles. Take the first. It is as follows :

“ Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

“ There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions ; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible ; and in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.”

Is not this intended as authoritative teaching respecting the Divine Being? Will any man have the hardihood to assert that the Church does not mean, by this Article, authoritatively to declare that a belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the one living and true God, is essential to communion with her, as one of her ministers or members? No man of common honesty, to whom the question is proposed, will answer it in the negative. Let any plain, unsophisticated man, read the other Articles, and put similar questions to himself respecting each of them, and I hesitate not to assert, that, though he may not believe all that they contain, his conclusions, as to their authority, as to the design of the framers of them, and of the Church in imposing them, will be very different from that expressed by Mr. Sewell.

But, to set this matter at rest, let us attend to the words of the King prefixed to the Articles. “The Articles of the Church of England (which have been allowed and authorized heretofore, and which our clergy generally have subscribed unto) do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God’s word ; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles.” Although this requires no confirmation, we may add to it the words of Bishop Burnet. In the preface to his Exposition of the Articles, he calls them “the sum of our doctrine, and the confession of our faith.” In the face of this, Mr. S. has the courage to say the Articles were not intended as a body of dogmatical teaching.

2ndly. He says they were intended “as marks set upon certain existing errors, to warn us against them, leaving the whole space between them free and open.” Mr. S.’s meaning in the latter clause of this sentence is not very obvious. Perhaps he is designedly obscure on the principle inculcated by the Tract writers, to write mysteriously, and to withhold a part of the meaning.* His meaning appears to be, that the whole space is left open

* In the following extract from the British Critic, one of the organs of the Oxford Tract writers, their principle of obscurity and mystery is developed.

“The age is all light, therefore the Church is bound to be,

between the Articles, and the errors against which they are to warn us. Open for what purpose? Is it that there may be included within it, persons of all shades of belief, between the doctrine of the Article and the opposite error? Apply this principle to the first Article which we have recited above. According to this principle, the first Article is intended, not to declare the existence and glory of the Divine Being as one God in three Persons, Father, Son, and Spirit; but to warn us against the error of denying the existence of a Deity; and the whole space between this error and the Article may be occupied by members of the Church, *i. e.* by persons of various shades of belief as it regards God; by all except Atheists, or, in other words, by Arians, Socinians, and even Deists. Now this is a fair specimen of the application of Mr. Sewell's principle. In fact, it is precisely in this way this principle is carried out, as it respects the Articles of Invocation of Saints, Transubstantiation, General Councils and Masses, by

we will not say, dark; for that is an ill-omened, forbidding word—but we will say, deep, impenetrable, occult in her views and character. Nay, we will not object to a certain measure of light, so that it be of the dim and awful kind. Something of this kind we must have; a retreat from our too much light; a Church which protects herself from the powerful and noxious glare, which settles upon her from without. We are assailed by science; we must protect ourselves by mystery. Mystery fits in with the age exactly. It is just what the age wants."

Mr. Newman in his letter to Dr. Jelf just now published.

“I want,” he says, “certain points left open which they would close. I am not speaking for myself, in one way or another ; I am not examining the scripturalness, safety, propriety, or expedience of the points in question ; but I desire that it may not be supposed as utterly unlawful for such private Christians as feel they can do it with a clear conscience, to allow a *comprecation* with the saints, as Bramhall does, or to hold with Andrews, that taking away the doctrine of transubstantiation from the mass, we shall have no dispute about the sacrifice ; or with Hooker, to treat even transubstantiation as an opinion which by itself need not cause separation ; or to hold with Hammond, that no general council, truly such, ever did, or shall err, in any matter of faith ; or with Bull, that man was in a supernatural state of grace before the fall, by which he could attain to immortality, and that he had recovered it in Christ ; or with Thorn-dyke, that works of humiliation and penance are requisite to render God again propitious to those who fall from the grace of baptism ; or with Pearson, that the name of Jesus is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Catholic Church.” Again he adds, “Though I consider the wording of the Articles is wide enough to admit persons of very different sentiments from each other in detail,

provided they agree in some broad general sense of them, (e. g. as differing from each other whether or not there is *any* state of purification after death, or whether or not *any* addresses are allowable to saints departed, so that they one and all condemn the Roman doctrine of purgatory and of invocation as actually taught and carried into effect,) yet I do not leave the Articles without their one *legitimate sense*, in preference to all other senses. The only peculiarity of the view I advocate, if I must so call it, is this, that whereas it is usual at this day to make the particular *belief of their writers* their true interpretation, I would make the belief of the Catholic Church such. That is, as it is often said that infants are regenerated in baptism, not on the faith of their parents, but of the Church ; so, in like manner, I would say the Articles are received, not in the sense of their framers, but (as far as the wording will admit, or any ambiguity requires it,) in the one catholic sense. For instance, as to purgatory, I consider with the homily, that the Article opposes the main idea encouraged by Rome, that temporary punishment is a substitute for hell in the case of the unholy, and all the superstitions consequent thereupon. As to the invocation, that the Article opposes, not every sort of calling on beings short of God, (for certain passages in the Psalms are such,) but all that trenches on worship, (as the homily puts it,)

the question whether *ora pro nobis*, be such, being open—not indifferent indeed, but a most grave and serious one for any individual who feels drawn to it, but still undecided by the article.”

Thus does Mr. Newman carry out this principle. That this induction of particulars by Mr. Newman is nothing more than the developement of Mr. Sewell’s principle is rendered indisputable by a distinct intimation of his, that there is “ambiguity” in the Articles, and “that this characteristic of them should be exhibited in the light of a most wise and charitable moderation, and a blessing for which we should be thankful.” Ambiguity! If there be any case which, from the very nature of it, excludes ambiguity, this is the one. Ambiguity in Articles, the express object of which is, the systematic exposition of the great principles and truths of Christianity, inclusive of its ordinances and duties, as held by the Church! Monstrous as is this position, it is essential to their vindication who are conscious that they do not believe the Articles in their plain, grammatical sense, and yet desire to continue members of the Established Church; or, in plain language, who have embraced the errors of the Church of Rome, but are unwilling to abandon their station and advantages in the Church of England.

The novel mode of interpreting the Articles recommended by these gentlemen must not be passed over. “Whereas,” says Mr. Newman, “it is

usual to make the particular belief of the writers of the Articles their true interpretation, I would make the belief of the Catholic Church such. That is," adds he, "as it is often said that infants are regenerated in baptism, not on the faith of their parents, but of the Church ; so, in like manner, I would say the Articles are received, not in the sense of their framers, but in the one catholic sense." To pass over, for the present, the assumption of regeneration in baptism, and that not on the faith of the parents, or of the sponsors, but of the Church, look at the jesuitical sophistry of receiving and subscribing the Articles, not in their plain grammatical sense, not in the sense of their framers, but of the Church." What is the Church? Are the archbishops and bishops the Church? Suppose they differ in opinion? Are the inferior clergy the Church? That they differ is notorious. What party is to be followed? Is it Dr. Pusey and his disciples, or those who denounce his doctrine? Mr. Sewell, in his first article in the *Quarterly Review*, recommends it to the government to banish the Jesuits from Ireland. I cordially join in the recommendation, only requiring that the government should deal with impartial justice, and banish the Jesuits from Oxford as well as from Ireland.

This part of the subject demands further examination. It is of essential importance to fix the public attention on the description of persons who,

according to those gentlemen, are embraced within the expansive circumference of the Thirty-nine Articles. 1st, they include persons who allow *comprehension* with the saints. This phraseology exhibits a specimen of the prudent mysteriousness of the Tract writers. A clue to its meaning is, however, given afterwards, by the intimation that the Articles allow a certain kind of addresses to saints departed ; 2nd, they include persons who hold transubstantiation ; 3rd, they include persons who hold that no general council ever did, or shall err ;* 4th, they include persons who hold that works of humiliation and penance render God propitious to sinners ; 5th, they include persons who hold that there is some kind of state of purification after death. If the Articles embrace all these persons, then what was the Reformation ? What was the dispute between Queen Mary and the reformers ? What is the dispute at this hour between us and the Roman Catholics ? What is that false religion of the Romish priesthood of Ireland, on which Mr. Sewell casts his anathema, and for which he would substitute his own religion, and wherein does the difference between them consist ? Shades of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, come forth ! Come forth, that ye may be stripped of honours which you have long unworthily borne, and of crowns of martyrdom to which you have no claim ! Your own Articles of religion are identical, it appears, with the

* Directly in contradiction of the very words of Article XXI.

doctrines of Gardiner and Bonner, and you were, therefore, not martyrs but suicides !

It is impossible to understand the following paragraph of Mr. Sewell's letter in any sense short of a distinct avowal of his approval of the Tract No. 90. "Are there not tender and delicate minds, whose eyes are to be couched gradually if they are in darkness, and for whose sake we are bound to be cautious ? Does not any shock in religious opinion, even if in some instances it bring us to truth, unsettle the mind, and dispose it generally for the reception of paradoxes, and therefore of error ? And would it not have been well, if a *truth so obvious as that asserted in the Tract* had been put forward without hazarding the creation of alarm and opposition ?" It is clear from all this, that what "the Tract asserts" is, in Mr. S.'s opinion, "truth," "obvious truth;" and the only fault Mr. Newman has committed is, putting it forward so as to hazard the creation of alarm and opposition. Caution should have been used : the eyes of tender and delicate persons should have been previously couched. Let this paragraph be viewed in connexion with Mr. S.'s own account of the Articles, and of the mode of interpreting them, and it will appear unquestionable, that while he desires to escape from the position in which the Tract writers have placed themselves, he goes, as to the Articles at least, the full length with them in their jesuitical interpretations. This is not the tone or language which one who had a proper sense of

the pernicious nature and tendency of the Tract would use. Error or falsehood, and not truth, is the word he would employ in designating it. He would not speak of a cautious mode of advancing it, or of couching eyes, but condemn it, as that which should be cast aside. It is clearly not the bad principles of the Tract which our author fears, but the odium which it has created. He is alarmed at the outcry which it has raised of "Popery at Oxford."

The manner in which our author speaks of the church, styling it (the Church of England, it is presumed) the Catholic Church, and ascribing to it catholicity, is exactly similar to the language used by the Church of Rome respecting herself. The use of such language by the Church of Rome is consistent, assuming, as she does, to be the only true church, and that none out of her pale are Christians. Does our author make the same claim for our Established Church? What his meaning may be, it is difficult to discover, even from his larger work, entitled "Christian Morals."

Some of his representations concerning the Church are extraordinary and sufficiently startling. Take the following example: "Once more, these powers," the powers of the Church, "are very great; they are even awful: if not truly conferred by God, they are blasphemously assumed by man. The promise of communicating to man the Divine nature itself, of bringing down the Deity from heaven, and infusing his own Spirit into the souls of

miserable mortals—this, which is nothing more than the every-day promise of the Church, proclaimed and administered by every minister of the Church, every time that he stands by the font, or serves at the altar—is it not so awful, so tremendous, that we scarcely bear to read it written, except in familiar words which scarcely touch the ear? Should we not expect that such a lie, if lie it be, if God has never sanctioned the offer, must long since have drawn down vengeance on the blasphemers, instead of being preserved for eighteen hundred years as a great and holy treasure, the very palladium of the Church, the corner-stone of the christian faith, the salt of the earth?” Again, he says, “I will rather suggest the consideration of the vastness of the power claimed by the Church—a power which places it almost on a level with God himself—the power of forgiving sins, by wiping them out in baptism, of transferring souls from hell to heaven, without admitting a doubt of it, as when baptized infants, it is said, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved;—the power of bringing down the Spirit of God from heaven, and incorporating it in the persons of frail and fleshly man. Think, I say, of this stupendous power; and then ask if any human being could dare to assume it, without authority from God himself. If such authority has never been given, then the Church, in every one of its most solemn acts, is guilty of the most frightful blasphemy. If it has

been given, is it not a fearful thing to make light of or to dispute it? And when, in this dull, cold, mechanical age, men say that the age of miracles is gone by, that the time is past for spiritual gifts, and the deification of men, and supernatural communication, and all the dreams, as they dare to call them, of the superstitious infancy of the world, remember that even now the Church is upon earth claiming every day, and exercising, the same stupendous power as it exercised in the first ages of Christianity."

The constitution and polity of this Church are thus described by our author: "The Catholic Church is, in the first place, essentially independent of any human power. It is founded by God—its rulers are individual bishops, assisted by councils of clergy in each diocese—its supreme authority lies in a council of these bishops—each diocesan church is especially enjoined to lay the one true doctrine publicly before men, that it may not be suppressed or perverted. And though each separate branch is liable to error, yet altogether, as a catholic body, they would preserve the truth."

That all this is exclusive, belonging solely to the Church of England, or, as he calls it, the Catholic Church, is rendered indisputable by the following paragraph. "No other professed ministers of God in this country can say the same. The Romanist has received the powers, but he confesses to have altered the doctrines in their transmission." (Where

does he confess this?) “The Dissenter does not even pretend to have received either the powers or the doctrines. He asserts, indeed, doctrines, and some few assert powers; but both are traced to man, to some human teacher of late date, or to some conception of his own.”

These quotations will exhibit what, to many, is new and unexpected. The Catholic Church, so constituted and gifted, possesses, it seems, by its ministers, the power of imparting gifts, as extraordinary, and in some respects greater, than any which the apostles conferred, viz. forgiveness of sins and the Holy Ghost in baptism, and the body of Christ in the Lord's supper. Is this the doctrine hitherto held by English Protestants? Is this the doctrine of our Articles and Prayer-book? Hear the definition of our reformers respecting the Church. The 19th Article, defining the Church, is as follows:—

“The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.” The 55th canon also speaks thus of the Church: “Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of christian people dispersed throughout the whole world.” How admirably do the scriptural wisdom and charity of our reformers shine forth in these statements! They are in the very spirit of the prayer of St. Paul—

“ Grace be with all those that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity !”

A church is a congregation of faithful men, i. e. of believers of the Gospel, in which the pure word of Christ is preached, and the sacraments duly ministered. Such churches were numerous in the apostles' days : as the church at Corinth, the church at Philippi, the church at Ephesus, the churches of Galatia ; and, God be praised, such churches are numerous now in the various parts of the world. He is a blind bigot, instead of an intelligent member of the Church of England, who, in the face of the definition in our Article and the prayer enjoined in the canon, will recognize no congregation, as a christian church, although the pure word of God be preached in it, and the sacraments duly ministered, because it may be differently constituted from ours as to external circumstances and order. We have good reason for preferring our own order, and let us steadily maintain it. God has condescended to accept our labours, and to bless us ; but let us maintain our order in the bond of peace. To assert that ours is *the Catholic Church*, and that no other, not similarly constituted, is a christian church, directly contravenes not merely the spirit of the Article, but the express letter of the canon : “ Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church ; that is, for the whole congregation of christian people dispersed throughout the whole world.” Yes, the bigot will retort, this means only those

belonging to such churches as ours. But the bigot is in error : for the canon proceeds farther, and adds, “ especially for the churches of England, *Scotland*, and Ireland.” Is the Church of Scotland similarly constituted to ours? Away then with this bigotry.

In the New Testament, the only pure source of knowledge on this subject, the word “ Church ” is never used in connexion with religion in any sense, except the three following, viz. to denote, 1st, a body of Christians, or believers in our Saviour’s gospel, in some particular place or city, as the church at Colosse, the church at Philippi ; 2ndly, the collective body of the redeemed throughout the whole world, i. e. the church militant here on earth ; and, 3rdly, the collective body of the redeemed, consisting of its two great parts, that militant here on earth, and that triumphant above, as it shall appear at last in heaven. In this latter sense the word is used in Hebrews xii. 23. How gratifying to the christian member of the Church of England, and how honourable to the memory of our reformers, that to these three scriptural senses of the word, Church, our article and canon exactly correspond ! *

* The word “ Churches ” is used in another sense in one passage, viz. Acts xix. 37. It appears to be applied to buildings. But the Greek word (*ιεροσυλους*) should be rendered, not robbers of *Churches*, but robbers of *Temples* ; the town-clerk of Ephesus using the word obviously of heathen temples, and not of buildings appropriated to christian worship. No such things existed at the time, it is probable : if there did, he certainly knew nothing of them.

The manner in which our author and his friends speak of the dissenters from the Church, involves matter for grave consideration. Mr. Sewell's language in the paragraph above quoted is sufficiently explicit. So is his language in the Quarterly Review. The Tract writers distinctly intimate that the Dissenters are out of the covenanted mercies of God, and that if they be saved, (of which, however, they do not express any doubt,) it will be in a way beyond those covenanted mercies.* And let it be noted that it is of Protestant Dissenters, and only of them, this is said. The Roman Catholics are regarded in a more favourable light. They belong to the true Church, and are only erring members of it. Now the whole people of Scotland, with a very small exception, are Protestant Dissenters, in respect of the Church of England. Of the same description are the several classes of Presbyterians in the north of Ireland. To these are to be added many other Dissenters in Ireland, and a large body of the same class in this country. But putting out of the account the people of Scotland, we have a great body of Dis-

* That the Tract writers and their disciples regard the Church of Scotland as on the same level with other Dissenters, if it were formerly doubtful, has been rendered indisputable by recent proceedings and speeches in one of the great church societies in this city. A vote implying this was proposed by some of the party, and would probably have been carried, but for the christian wisdom of one in authority, who, with his characteristic energy and promptness, interposed and prevented this piece of folly.

senters in this country and in Ireland. Shall we get rid of these people, or diminish their numbers by misrepresenting and abusing them? Such conduct on our part cannot fail of disgusting and irritating them. Setting aside the impolicy of it, it is, as a crime, inconsistent with our christian profession. It should also be remembered that a large body of the present Dissenters have become such, have actually been forced into this position, partly by the neglect of the state to provide means of spiritual instruction for the people, and partly by the unscriptural quality of the instruction which, in years that are past, too many of the Established clergy furnished to them. Even Mr. Sewell seems to admit the operation of this latter cause of dissent, in that passage of his article in the Quarterly Review, where he speaks of the revival of religion in the Church of this country by the labours of Whitfield and Wesley. This should never be left out of sight in dealing with the Dissenters. We left them to find a religion for themselves. If, by the goodness of God, many of them have been led to truth and salvation, we should be thankful; and if some of them have fallen into false doctrines, our concern should be mingled with self-reproach and shame. The Dissenters, it will doubtless be urged, have given great provocation by their hostile proceedings towards the Church, and their avowed desire for its overthrow. Even here, however, justice is not

done them. These obnoxious proceedings have been the work of comparatively a small party among them. In all religious, as in other, communities, persons are to be found under the influence of bad passions, restless and ambitious persons. These, joined with the well-meaning, but weak, and ill-judging, form a party, take the lead, and commit aggressions and follies, and sometimes crimes; and these acts are laid at the door of the whole body, and thus the innocent and the guilty are branded with the same mark. This has been, in a degree of which but few are aware, the case of the Dissenters. But, setting this aside, suppose them all to be disaffected towards the Established Church, will injustice and abuse convert them into friends? Or is it the best mode of convincing them that ours is the only christian church? To leave the case thus, however, would be to violate what I feel to be the dictates of duty and conscience. I know, and I hesitate not to add, that they have done in times past, and are now doing, good service to the cause of God and true religion. In Ireland, while, in former times, the Irish clergy, in too many parishes, were slumbering at their post, the Dissenters were zealous and laborious. It can be proved, by incontrovertible evidence, that, but for them and the Wesleyan Methodists, Protestantism would have been extinct in the south of Ireland. It would be gross injustice to deny that in this country also they have been instrumental in

a high degree in the advancement of religion ; and among them have appeared many men of deep piety and powerful minds, who have added to the stock of religious literature and knowledge.*

The proper mode of dealing with Dissenters is to show no jealousy of them ; to treat them with consideration, kindness, and confidence, and to co-operate with them, as far as principle and our duty to our Church will allow, in works of christian charity. Acting on this principle, the minister of the Established Church will always be able, in his parish, to live in harmony with them ; and, if he do not bring over some of their body to join the Church, he and they, united in acts of brotherhood and kindness, will feel towards each other as children of a common God and Saviour, and heirs of a common inheritance above. On the other hand, adopt the principle of the Tract writers, and what will be the result ? We may figure to ourselves a diocese or parish presided over by one of these gentlemen. Although no vision of the kind may have passed across the imagination of Mr. Sewell, yet he may be induced, perhaps, to pardon me for supposing the possibility of his elevation to the episcopal bench. What a pattern of christian brotherhood, harmony, and peace, will a diocese, blessed by his superintendence, speedily exhibit !

* For example, Owen, Baxter, Doddridge, Watts, Robert Hall, in past times ; to which the names of living authors might be added.

He will hasten to place in the several parishes, pastors after his own mind, who will open up to the churchmen their high and exclusive privileges, and describe, at the same time, the degradation and wretchedness of the Dissenters, out of the covenanted mercies of God, and with a ministry destitute alike of "doctrine and of power." With what satisfaction and concord will these announcements be received! What a happy expedient for promoting among the parishioners mutual confidence and respect! How cordially will they unite in doing good, in relieving the poor, instructing the ignorant, and reclaiming the vicious! With what harmony will parish vestries be conducted, and with what alacrity and liberality will church-rates be voted and paid!

The expediency of discontinuing the Oxford Tracts, at least in their present shape, is suggested by our author, on the ground that "the continuance may lead to collisions;" and he urges his suggestion by the following considerations: "The object is accomplished for which you first commenced your labours, the fundamental principles which you have advocated have taken root and spread, and are advancing every day with a rapidity, which ten years since *we* should have pronounced it a delusion to imagine." Mr. Newman in his letter to Dr. Jelf throws light on the nature of this advancement, and develops the principles which have taken root. He describes the great progress of the

religious mind of our Church, and represents the age as moving towards something which, he assures us, is to be found only in the Church of Rome! Hear his words: "In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any church system, still all bear witness to it. Mr. Alexander Knox in Ireland bears a most overpowering witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us, which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called catholic." In a different form of words, but, perhaps, more significant, Mr. Sewell, in his "Christian Morals," expresses his preference of the Romish Church, and his sense of her superiority over Protestantism. Mark his words. "The time will come, say modern historians, and say truly, when, comparatively

we shall venerate the character of Queen Mary, and condemn that of Elizabeth.”

With much tact and skill, the names of certain popular writers are pressed into the service of this cause. That Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, and Mr. Coleridge were poets and philosophers, and that theirs are great names in literature, is freely conceded. Indeed no one can deny it. That the last two may have written something by which they have borne witness to the religious progress of the age, may be true. Though not unacquainted with their writings, I am at a loss, however, to fix on the particular work of either, to which the allusion is made. As for Sir Walter Scott, with a better acquaintance with his writings than perhaps some may be disposed to approve, I am unable even to form a conjecture as to the poem or novel to which the remark applies. Poetry, mystery, and romance, works of imagination and fancy, and the legends of tradition, are not, however, unsuited to the doctrine of the Tract writers ; and it may be, that there is something in common between them and Sir Walter Scott. As for Mr. Irving, he was, I believe, a good man, and while he had his senses, desired to do good. But it is, in his case, so difficult to draw the line between the period of his sanity, and that of his becoming a crack-brained enthusiast, (I use this epithet, not in levity, but to distinguish his case from that of one so mentally deranged as to be a fit subject for

restraint,) that he is one of the last persons I should have selected as a witness to any disputed fact, and still less should I have relied on his judgment in any matter of reasoning or deduction. The Tract writers are welcome to him. They know best from what class to choose their witnesses.

The case is very different, however, as regards Mr. Alexander Knox. In selecting him for a witness, these gentlemen have showed a sound discretion. He was the very person for their purpose. Whoever is acquainted with his published correspondence with the late Bishop Jebb, and capable of forming a correct judgment concerning religious sentiment, will be aware that he was the stanch and able advocate of the system of the Oxford Tract writers. In fact, the Oxford Tract writers are only his imitators, and some of them have been his pupils in the school of religion.* In the commencement of his career, he

The following extracts from his published letters to the late Bishop Jebb will abundantly confirm this statement:—

“Do you observe how studiously R—— calls the French Roman Catholics *Episcopal*, as if to identify them with us? I only say, be it so. Hoc juvat et melli est. I am conscious of as real reformed feelings as any one; but most deliberately I prize what the Church of Rome possesses, so deeply, as to make me prefer their religion to sectarianism, in whatever plausible form the latter may appear.”

Again:—“If the Roman Catholic religion had answered no other purpose than to keep up the respect for the Fathers, there would be indemnification for all its crudities.”

was a Wesleyan Methodist. I state this on his own authority. In the year 1802 he published a

Again :—" What perverse influence the nickname of *Protestant* has had in our Church ! Ever since this perverse epithet became fashionable, its vulgar definition has had more authority with churchmen themselves than all the settled standards to which they were bound ; and the consequence has been a steady increase of ignorance, coldness, and vacillation."

Again :—" Z. does not enough see that our reformers were not founders of a church. He does not enough see that, in recognizing the right of the Church to decide in controversies of faith, there was an allegiance to the Church Catholic, acknowledged by our Church, which reduces all that was done about articles and homilies to such a municipal rank, as to make it, of necessity, but subordinately and conditionally obligatory, even on subscribers. In such a subscription the rights of the Church Catholic were evidently saved, by the simultaneous acknowledgment of those rights ; it being not the Church of England merely, but, *a fortiori* at least, the Church universal, which ought to be listened to. If, therefore, the Church of England has unwittingly attempted anything contrary to the voice of the Church Catholic, she has placed herself under correction by the paramount principle which she has acknowledged ; and all her specific propositions are, of course, to be limited by her primary concession."

Again :—" It shows that in that simplicity of *Bible religion* which so many exclusively contend for, and so many more unconsciously strive to diffuse, there is no security for any man, however honest, however intentionally pious, being completely, himself, what he substantially now is, at any future period ; suppose at twenty, fifteen, ten, or even seven years' end."

Again :—" It just occurs to me to direct your attention to a passage in Doddridge's " Essay on Inspiration," where he liberally allows the probability of the great heathen luminaries being divinely inspired ; and also considers it most likely that inspiration, in some degree, may have existed in every age of the Christian

defence of the doctrine and discipline of that body in a letter to the late Rev. John Walker, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. From much that is good and scriptural in the religious principles of the Methodists, he soon diverged; and by degrees, step by step, (his correspondence with Bishop Jebb distinctly marks the downward course,) he advanced, first to the mysticism of Popery, and next to the adoption of Popish expositions of scriptural doctrines, until at length he took his station, if not at the inside, certainly at the very verge of the vestibule of the Church of Rome. For many years he was mixed up, more or less, with the religious affairs of Ireland. Various institutions which had for their object the advancement of the pure principles of the Protestant faith, he strongly

church. This just opinion (as I entirely conceive it to be) at once admits the solid value of pagan philosophy, and strengthens the subordinate authority which we, and those who have thought with us, ascribe to Catholic tradition."

This is a specimen of Mr. Knox's correspondence with Bishop Jebb. It is but justice to Doddridge, to whom a most absurd theory is attributed in the last extract, to say that there is nothing in his "Essay on Inspiration," which I can discover, to warrant the assertion, that he attributed inspiration to the Fathers; nor, without a monstrous exaggeration of what he has really said of the ancient philosophers, can it be asserted that he attributed inspiration to them. There is indeed much error in what he says concerning the inspiration of Holy Scripture. He overlooked the fact, that we can learn in what sense Holy Scripture is inspired, only from Scripture itself; and that Scripture claims for itself, in all its parts, plenary, verbal inspiration.

opposed. By the goodness of God his opposition was vain. He was steadily met, and his influence and efforts counteracted ; insomuch that the institutions which fell under his displeasure took deep root and prospered ; and it is in connexion with them, that the great body of Irish clergymen are to be found at this day, on whom Mr. Sewell, in the Quarterly Review, has passed so glowing an eulogium.

Had I nothing more to state concerning Mr. Knox, I should have passed his name unnoticed. But it is due to the memory of that gentleman, and still more to the praise of that divine mercy which opens the eyes of the blind, and turns the sinner from the error of his ways, to record the happy change which took place in his religious sentiments, and, as there is reason to hope, in his state before God, some months before his death. The principles of which he had made his boast through life, failed him at the close of it. They gave no support to his soul in the prospect of his appearance before the judgment-seat. That evangelical religion, which he had so long stigmatized and denounced, appeared to him, in the hour of trial, as pointing to the only place of refuge and safety. His own language sufficiently describes the worthlessness of his former system. "What I have most to complain of," said he shortly before his decease, "is, that my mind is not happy. I begin to suspect that my views have not been sufficiently evangelical, and I am disposed to trace

the present depression of my mind to that cause." The respected individual to whom this confession was made, expresses his persuasion, founded on further communications with him, that Mr. Knox sought and found peace in the atonement of our Saviour.*

These extracts show what it is that these gentlemen contemplate. That from Mr. Sewell exhibits him as triumphing in the progress and advancement of the principles advanced in the Tracts; and that from Mr. Newman's letter points to the Church of Rome as possessed of that *mysterious something* to which these principles lead.

Special notice must be taken of our author's statements on the subject of baptism. The following extracts from his "Christian Morals" present his views on this subject.

"My object is to point out the ethical views exhibited by the ancient Catholic Church in its celebration of baptism, and preserved by our own branch of it, though we have not retained all the forms by which they were expressed;—views respecting the condition of human nature, the end to which it should be brought, and the means of educating it. And having prepared you, I hope, not to turn away in ridicule from what silly and ignorant men would now be disposed to call superstitious mummeries, I will take in order the chief ceremonies which the Church would have per-

* See Appendix.

formed over an infant, when she commenced its education. The first is one which, in this age of miscalled enlightenment, when men can scarcely bring themselves to believe that there are either angels or spirits, much less that there are spirits of evil about us, will startle them the most.

“The Church would have first taken the infant and *solemnly exorcised it*: that is, by prayer and breathing upon it, and making the sign of the cross upon the forehead, and imposition of hands, it would endeavour to free it from the powers of an evil spirit, to which its birth subjected it; per exorcismum contra diabolum vindicatus. No one is admitted into the Church, says Cyprian, unless they have first been exorcised and baptized, nisi exorcizati et baptizati prius fuerint. To purge from the devil, purget a diabolo, is the expression of another writer. Purgatio exorcismi, the fire of exorcism, the driving away the unclean spirit, and other terms for the same thing. When any one comes to the sacrament of baptism, whether he be an infant or an adult, they are not admitted to the fountain of life, before, by exorcisms and insufflations of the clergy, the unclean spirit is driven from them. Receive the right of exorcism, says St. Cyril, with solemnity. When thou art exorcised, when thou art breathed on, think it a means of salvation, σωτηρια σοι το πραγμα νομισον ειναι.” He adds, “We are not concerned to defend either the ancient Catholic Church, who retained this prac-

tice of exorcism, which our Lord and his apostles had practised themselves, nor our own English reformers who rejected it, as not being essential to the sacrament of baptism, and liable to superstitious abuses. It would be far better for us all, if we were more superstitious than we are ; for superstition is better than indifference.”

Again, he says, “ When the person whose education the Church was undertaking was brought to be baptized, he was first, either in his own person, or in his sponsors, placed towards the west, barefooted, and stripped of his outer garments, his hands stretched out, as if pushing an enemy from him, his head averted, and thrice was he bidden to spit in the face of Satan, as a form of abhorrence and rejection, and thrice to renounce him and all his works. And then he was turned to the east, his eyes lifted up to heaven, his hands stretched out in prayer, and he was called on to make a solemn profession of entering into the service of another master, Christ.” He proceeds to put this question, “ What then are the blessings thus conveyed to us by baptism ? The first was thus indicated in the ancient Church by unclothing the person who came to be baptized. When, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, “ ye entered into the baptistry, you were stripped of your tunic ; and this was the image of your putting off the old man, with the deeds thereof. For since the powers of the adversary used to burrow, as it were, and take

up their abode in your limbs, no longer is it lawful to wear that clothing of the old body ; I mean not that which we see, but the body of the old man, which is corrupted in the devices of deceit." He further adds, " But in the ancient Church even greater things than these were symbolized in the rite of baptism. It was called not only a death unto sin, an indulgence, or remission of sin, but regeneration, unction, illumination, salvation, a seal of the Lord, a consecration, an initiation, a glory !"

A judgment may be formed, from these extracts, of that Church which our author regards as the catholic, primitive church, and to which he would bring us back. And here we have a specimen of the boasted meekness and humility of Mr. Sewell and his coadjutors. We are to be branded, it seems, " as silly and ignorant men," if we presume to question or doubt the soundness and importance of the rites of this Church. Be it so. I humbly submit to be thus branded ; and unhesitatingly I fix the name of " superstitious mummeries" on these rites. View the pernicious absurdities by which the christian ordinance of baptism is to be overlaid and perverted. The infant must be solemnly exorcised by prayer, and breathing on it, and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross ; by these means, by exorcism, and insufflations of the clergy, he is to be purged from the devil. If an adult be the subject of baptism, he is to be placed

towards the west, barefooted and stripped of his outer garments, his hands stretched out, his head averted, and thrice he is to spit at the devil. And this rite of baptism, accompanied by such mummeries, is called a remission of sin, illumination, salvation, consecration, glory ! No one who reads our author's book can doubt that he regrets the absence of these disgusting tricks of priestcraft in the ceremony of baptism. God be praised that we can place, in bright contrast with all this, the Article of our Church on baptism.

Article 27.—Of Baptism.

“Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church : the promises of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are really signed and sealed ; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.”

The simplicity and truth with which the nature, design, and uses of this ordinance are here set forth, commend themselves to our judgment. We bring our child to be baptized with an humble acknowledgment on behalf of him and of ourselves, that we are born in sin and children of wrath, and that, except we be born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom of God. We dedicate our child to

God, and, as far as any act of ours can do it, graft him into Christ's visible church. In our prayers we plead the promises of forgiveness of sin and adoption into the family of God by the Holy Ghost. We use the sign and seal of the covenant, and supplicate for our offspring the vouchsafement of the thing signified. Baptism, then, is regarded by the Christian as no insignificant or unimportant act, but as a blessed privilege and means of grace. He does not, indeed, substitute it for spiritual regeneration. Nor does the Church of England. The Article plainly distinguishes it from spiritual regeneration, making it only the sign of such regeneration. The ceremony for the public baptism of adults carefully provides that the candidates for it shall be such as furnish evidence of their having already received the thing signified, i. e. spiritual regeneration: or in other words, as the ceremony expresses it, that they have "truly repented and come to God by faith." The Collect for Christmas-day traces it to its true source and author: "Grant that we, being regenerated and made thy children by *adoption* and *grace*, may be daily *renewed* by thy *Holy Spirit*." Corresponding to which is the prayer in another of the collects, "Create and make in us new and contrite hearts." If any doubt remained as to the meaning of the formularies of our Church on the subject, that doubt is dissipated by the strong language of Bishop

Latimer:—"Christ saith, Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. He must be regenerate. And what is this regeneration? It is, not to be christened with water, as the firebrands, the Papists, expound it, and nothing else. How is it to be expounded? St. Peter showeth that one place of Scripture declareth another. It is the collection of places that maketh the Scripture plain. Saith St. Peter, we be born again. How? Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal. What is this immortal seed? By the word of the living God: by the word of God preached and opened. Thus cometh in our new birth." In such coarse and homely language (the coarseness of it, although *then* not unusual, would in the present times be inexcusable) does this holy reformer and martyr repel with scorn the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, at the same time that he explains that new birth or change of heart inculcated by our Saviour, and the mode of its production. Now, bearing in mind that he was one of the few persons by whom, under the authority of the crown, our Articles and Formularies were prepared and constructed, with what face can any one pretend that these Articles and Formularies are to be interpreted, not in the sense which he declares to be the true one, but in that which he declares to be the false one? *

* To all this will perhaps be objected the following words in the baptismal ceremony: "Seeing now that this child is regene-

What does the Established Church say on this subject, is an important question, as bearing on the consistency and honesty of its members. But it

rate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits." This passage is triumphantly adduced by the advocates of baptismal regeneration, as establishing the fact that such is the doctrine of the Church of England. I have never considered it as having any weight against the plain language of the Article. The words of the baptismal ceremony are unquestionably to be explained in conformity with the Article, instead of twisting the Article to meet the apparent meaning of the ceremony. The words of the ceremony (limited by the Article, and by the well-known sentiments of the reformers) signify no more than that infants, the children of christian parents, are within the covenant. The Lord said to his servant of old, (Genesis xvii. 7,) "I am a God to thee and to thy seed." And St. Paul lays down the same principle, 1 Cor. vii. 14.) After directing that a believing wife is not to leave an unbelieving husband, if he be pleased to dwell with her, he adds, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the (believing) husband; else," says he, "*were your children unclean: but now are they holy.*" It is the covenant of mercy, including within it one or both of the parents, which entitles the child to baptism, and seals its blessings to the child. Heathen children have no right to christian baptism. Missionaries are not sent among the heathen to carry off their children and baptize them. They are sent to preach to the adults; and when the adults have been instructed in the Gospel, and brought to make a credible profession of it, they, and their children with them, are baptized. An old writer of our Church, William Attersal, says,

"Seeing such as come to this sacrament must be Christians before, it appeareth to be a very corrupt custom of the people, when they require baptism of the pastor for their children, to say

shrinks into utter insignificance, compared with the question, What does the Bible say? That is the only test and standard of truth. By it the

God hath given me a Pagan, I desire you to make him a Christian. For baptism cannot make a Christian, but signify it; the sacraments cannot make that which is not, but assure that which is already made, as seals do not give the right, but confirm it."

In support of this view, I am now enabled to adduce the authority of one of much eminence, and as high a churchman as any of the advocates of baptismal regeneration can require. I allude to the Rev. Dr. Miller, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and at present holding one of the highest stations in the diocese of Armagh, under his Grace, the Primate of Ireland. In a letter which he has published, addressed to Dr. Pusey, he uses the following expressions: "In regard to the sacrament of baptism, I have not any objection to urge, holding as I do with you, that baptismal regeneration is the express doctrine of our Church." Attend now to Dr. Miller's explanation of this. In a letter published in February last, addressed to Mr. Sewell, he makes the following statement:

"I received a letter," he says, "from the north of England, written in a kind and even humble spirit, by a person describing himself as a lay member of the Church of England. In it the writer informed me of his disappointed feeling in discovering that I held the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Though the writer professed not to expect an answer, I thought it my duty to endeavour to bring him to a sounder judgment in religion, and represented to him, that what I understood by the doctrine was, that *an infant is, by baptism, brought into the covenant of mercy*, and if he should die in this state, would, accordingly, be an object of acceptance with God; and that he would also receive, from that time, such spiritual assistance, that, if he should attain to maturity, he might be enabled to work out his salvation." Such is Dr. Miller's explanation. Though the phraseology of the latter part of this sentence seems to indicate confusion in Dr. Miller's mind on a

doctrines of our Church and of every other church are to be tried ; and they are unhesitatingly to be cast aside, as counterfeit and false, unless it shall appear that they have been drawn from this, the only pure source. “ To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to it, it is because there is no light in them.” To this standard, Bishop Latimer, as we have seen, brings the question ; and the single text which he quotes from St. Peter is decisive of it, even though there were no other bearing on it. “ Being born again,” he says, “ not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever ;” adding, in a following verse, “ This is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.” The expression “ born again,” is precisely that which our Saviour uses in the third of

most important subject, the explanation confirms the view of the baptismal ceremony given above. Dr. Miller, it appears, means, by baptismal regeneration, nothing more than that the child is in the covenant of mercy, and will have the benefits of it ; a thing very different from Mr. Sewell’s view of it ; and very different also from that spiritual regeneration set forth by our Saviour in the third chapter of St. John.

Having introduced Dr. Miller’s name, it is but justice to that venerable and distinguished gentleman to add, that he has most ably exposed and refuted Mr. Sewell’s errors. Mr. S.’s attempts to escape are very entertaining. He turns, and twists, and writhes, and with the lubricity of an eel endeavours to slip away ; while Dr. Miller holds him with a giant’s grasp. He is no more capable of breaking a lance in argument with Dr. Miller, than a child of three years old would be to wrestle with Hercules.

St. John : “ Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” It undoubtedly means regeneration ; no one ever questioned it. Well, then, here the apostle describes the manner in which it is effected. There is not one word about baptism, not even an allusion to it. It is produced, according to this account of it, by the incorruptible seed of the word ; that is, as he explains it afterwards, by the Gospel. That Gospel, which announces the Divine mercy to sinful man, in providing a Saviour for him, in the person of his beloved Son, Jesus Christ ;—that Gospel, brought powerfully to the conscience by the teaching and influence of the Holy Spirit, is the instrument by which this change is effected. Unfolding at once our fallen, sinful, lost state, and the complete and all-sufficient remedy furnished by the Divine compassion, it gives rise to new feelings, inspires new hopes, opens new scenes, and leads to a new course of life. As St. Paul expresses it, “ If any man be in Christ Jesus (i. e. united to him by faith,) he is a new creature. Old things are passed away, behold all things are become new :” or, as our Saviour expresses it, “ he is born again of water and of the Spirit :” that is, the Spirit, which has approved the Gospel to his judgment and conscience, and opened his mind to receive it, daily cleanses and purifies his heart by faith.*

* To the above passages of Scripture may be added what is recorded (Acts viii. 36) respecting the baptism of the Ethiopian

If christian baptism be the instrument of regeneration, it follows that, as it was not instituted until after our Saviour's resurrection, none of the Old Testament saints were regenerated, and therefore none of them can have entered the kingdom of heaven. The Tract writers accordingly maintain that they were not regenerated, although they deny the consequence. They distinctly assert that Abraham was not regenerated, while they say he was, notwithstanding, saved, and thus directly contradict our Saviour's assurance, that except a man be regenerate, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. All those passages in which Abraham and others are called "the children of God,"* are so many distinct intimations of their regeneration. They became the children of God by faith in the promises, just as, according to the apostle's statement, we "became the children of God," not by eunuch, to whom Philip had preached. "And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Here we find that Philip would baptize the Ethiopian only on his receiving a satisfactory assurance that he was a believer; i. e. a Christian: or, in other words, that he had already been born again, through that "incorruptible seed of the word" which Philip had previously addressed to him. On receiving that assurance, he gave him "the outward and visible sign," of that inward and spiritual grace, *regeneration*, which God had already bestowed upon him.

* Deut. xiv. 1.

baptism, but “by faith in Christ Jesus.” Of that faith in the promises, circumcision was the sign and seal to the Old Testament saints, in like manner as baptism is to us, under the New Testament Church. * It should also be noted, that the expression “water,” conjoined with that of Holy Spirit,” used in the New Testament, is of frequent occurrence, in a similar connexion in the Old Testament. † This conjoint use of the two words to signify one and the same thing, viz. the spirit only, has led those imperfectly acquainted with the phraseology of Scripture, to suppose that baptism is meant, in passages where there is no allusion to it.

Consider what is involved in the assumption that, when our Saviour said, “Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,” he meant baptism. If he spake truly, what countless multitudes have perished, and are daily and hourly perishing, not in heathen, but in christian lands! 1. All infants who die unbaptized; 2. all the children of adult baptists, who, from the fault of their parents, die, at whatever age, before they receive baptism; 3. all Quakers; and the members of other religious bodies of various denominations, who, on this particular point, have erred, while, in all other respects, they may have exhibited the faith and practice of the servants of God. What a monstrous theory is this! and how abhor-

* Rom. iv. 9; Coloss. ii. 11. † Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. xlv. 3.

rent from it is the spirit of our Saviour's blessed religion !

There is another consideration which appears decisive on this question. It is suggested by St. Paul's language respecting his own procedure as an apostle of Christ. Addressing the church at Corinth, where he had long laboured, he says, * " Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." If baptism be regeneration, would the apostle have used this language? Would he have added, " I thank God that I baptized none of you ?" What ! Was not the apostle sent by his divine Master to promote regeneration, that without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven? Yes, undoubtedly, this was the very object of his mission. But he says, he was not sent to baptize, and he thanks God that he had not baptized. Then it follows inevitably that baptism is not regeneration. If anything were necessary to establish this conclusion, it is supplied by what the apostle subjoins, viz. that " he was sent *to preach the Gospel*," i. e. the Gospel which, as we have learned from the apostle Peter, is the incorruptible seed by which we are born again, or regenerated. Then though St. Paul was not sent to baptize, he was sent to promote regeneration. There is no possibility of evading the force of this argument furnished by the apostle, except by a perversion or contempt of the word of God.

Nor let it be supposed for a moment, that this is

* 1 Cor. i. 24.

a mere speculative error of little importance : on the contrary, it strikes at the root of the christian system, and is one of the main props of the fabric of priestcraft. It unduly elevates the work and ministry of man, attributing to them that for which the word of God furnishes no sanction ; and further, whoever supposes that his original sin, the depravity and defilement of his nature, was washed away in baptism, and that he then received the Holy Ghost, and was made a new creature, will naturally look for nothing more than the continuance or enduring maintenance of what he then received ; and will be too apt to close his eyes to the evils of his heart and his various sins, and to the necessity for a better righteousness than his own, and for the daily, humble use of that prayer, “ God be merciful to me a sinner !”

In the following extracts, along with baptism, Mr. Sewell introduces the Lord’s supper. “ Immediately after the persons came up out of the water, if the bishop was present at the solemnity, they were presented to him, in order to receive his benediction ; which was a solemn prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon such as were baptized. And to this prayer there was usually joined the ceremony of a second unction and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross. It was the rite of confirmation. And upon this followed another practice, which, with our defective views of baptism and of the sacraments in general, will appear

almost unintelligible—the administration of the Holy Eucharist even to infants. This, remember, was not a modern innovation. In the words of Bingham, it was that known practice and custom in the ancient church, of giving the eucharist to infants, which continued in the church for several ages.”

He dilates on this in the following paragraph : “Who will dare to say that there is anything strange or incongruous in that theory of our spiritual life, which the Church pronounced, when, immediately the germ of life had been imparted, she administered new sustenance and food to it through the outward elements of bread and wine? that theory which the Catholic Church, at this day, retains, though with a dimmer apprehension and fainter belief, but which a modern ignorance has rejected. And what has it substituted instead? a speculation of spiritual vitality, nutrition, and growth, which believes life can be attained by self-agency, without being infused from without, and can be preserved by exercise, and hunger—by doing good works, and creating aspirations of desire, without any fresh support analogous to the reception of food. I do not dare to enter further into this solemn and mysterious subject. But as before it was said, that the foundation of christian ethics must be laid in the sacrament of baptism, and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, so let it now be asserted, that the whole superstructure rests on the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and the real,

spiritual, personal presence and communication of the blessed body of our Lord, to those who rightly partake in it. Until once more the Catholic Church in this country shall restore this awful mystery to its due prominence; until it makes prayer, and praise, and even right action, subservient to the reception of the holy communion, christian ethics will still remain a vague, inconsistent, fluctuating chaos of contradictory principles and empty feelings."

The light in which he regards the Lord's Supper is sufficiently marked in these passages; at the same time that the adroitness is admirable, with which, in the latter of them, by the insertion of a single word, the word *spiritual*, he has opened a loop-hole by which to escape, as he hopes, the imputation of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. Admirable, however, as is this adroitness, it certainly is not creditable, nor will it avail him. The most superficial reader must discern the true meaning. Indeed the words convey it clearly, although it may not be convenient to be forced to a confession, and, therefore, an equivocal phrase is hitched into the sentence, to serve the purpose of palliation or excuse. But let Mr. Sewell explain himself what is it which the Catholic Church has retained, but which modern ignorance has rejected? What is the solemn and mysterious subject into which he dare not enter? What does he mean by the real, personal presence and com-

munication (even with the word *spiritual* interposed) of the blessed body for our Lord? What is the awful mystery which the Catholic Church is to restore to its due prominence? When these questions are answered, it will be found that the word *spiritual*, hitched in between *real* and *bodily*, serves badly to conceal, and does not at all palliate, the pernicious delusion and error which he has broached.

On this subject of the Lord's Supper, the Oxford Tract writers express themselves in the following manner. "Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with the plain truth, that by separating themselves from our communion, they separate themselves from the only Church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord's body to give to the people?" Again: "Then you will honour us as entrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood." Again: "The days may come when your churches will be shut up; when you will be deprived of ministers of religion, or have only such as are destitute of God's commission. Do not by your neglect now add to your misery then, the bitterness of self-reproach, when you will have to say, I had once the means of receiving the body and blood of my Saviour at the hands of his ministers, but I refused it, and now he has placed it out of my power." Further: The doctrine of a sacri-

fice in the eucharist was held in high and awful honour in the primitive Church. The doctrine of the Church was this, that in the eucharist an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to God, under the form of bread and wine ; and this they believed to be the pure offering or sacrifice which the prophet Malachi foretold the Gentiles should offer.—The eucharist, then, consists of two parts, a commemorative sacrifice, and a communion or communication.—Lastly, they felt assured that this sacrifice offered by the Church on earth for the whole Church, conveyed to that portion of the Church which had passed into the unseen world, such benefits of Christ's death as were still applicable to them. It had ever been the custom of the Church to remember the dead in Christ. Whatever might become of their surmises of their efficiency, they comforted themselves, that, being according to the will of God, it must, in some way, be of benefit to them.—Why should we say that the dead in Christ have no interest in this, which is offered for all ?—This doctrine our Church still retains, though it is one of those most withdrawn from sight, lest it should be, perchance, misapplied or profaned.

These extracts from Mr. Sewell and his coadjutors present a series of fearful errors. — 1. The Lord's Supper given to infants immediately after their baptism ; 2. The real presence and communication of our Saviour's body and blood in it ;

3. The awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood, entrusted as an honour to the ministers of the Established Church ; 4. A sacrifice offered in the Lord's Supper, which conveys benefit to the *dead* ; 5. For these *dead*, prayer to be offered up. Setting aside for a moment the question as to whether all this be true doctrine or false, let us ask ourselves this question, Is it not the religion of Rome ? If these five particulars be not, every one of them, distinctive marks of the Roman Catholic religion, then wherein does that religion, as contradistinguished from Protestantism, consist ?

But this doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper is in all its parts unscriptural, and therefore unfounded and false. Let us turn from it to the simple narrative of the institution of this ordinance by our Saviour, as set forth by the evangelists. We have that narrative in three of the gospels ; that in St. Luke is as follows : " And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer : for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves : for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread and gave thanks, and

brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you : do this in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you ;” St. Matthew has it, “ for many, for the remission of sins.” Our Saviour’s words are few, plain, and unequivocal, and clearly define the nature and design of the institution : the bread represents his body, and the wine represents his blood. Exactly corresponding to this narrative is that of St. Paul : * “ I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread : and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood : this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” The last of these verses is St. Paul’s comment on our Saviour’s words, and is most instructive and important. In this narrative, so interesting and affecting, there is no appearance of mystery, nothing abstruse or beyond comprehension. Our Lord commands his disciples to commemorate his death, and its benefits and blessings, and prescribes the mode of doing

* 1 Cor. xi. 23.

it. His body was broken for them, in remembrance of which they were to take bread and break and eat it; his blood was shed for them, and the cup, which was the new testament, or covenant, in his blood, (or introduced and ratified by his blood,) was to be the memorial of it. They were to drink it in remembrance of his blood shed for the remission of sins.

What a significative, important, and blessed ordinance is this which our Saviour has vouchsafed to us, marking to us at once his wisdom and his love! It provides that amidst the various objects, business, and cares of life, we shall keep him in our recollection, and habitually meditate upon him. Enticed by temptation, deceived by our own wicked hearts, ensnared by sin, we should be prone to forget, or deny, or abandon him. In this ordinance he is exhibited, as it were, before our eyes, in all the attractions of his compassion, mercy, and love; and our languid faith is revived and confirmed. When we receive the emblems of his broken body and of his blood poured out on Calvary, we are reminded of his shame and suffering, of his cross and death, and of the cause of all,—our sin, guilt, and condemnation. We look on him whom we have pierced, and mourn for him; and while we repent and abhor ourselves as in dust and ashes, believing, our hearts are comforted by the assurance that “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.”

“ Who is he that condemneth ? Christ hath died ; yea, rather is risen again, and is at the right hand of God, and maketh intercession for us.” Thus we feed on him in our hearts by faith. In this act, by which we show his death, we also, as St. Paul’s words suggest, avow our hope of his second appearance in glory. “ Ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” What a miserable substitute for this grateful, joyful remembrance of our divine Saviour, and for this feeding on him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving, are the devices and inventions of priestcraft, which Mr. Sewell and his associates would impose on us !

Another subject, closely connected with those already examined, has also been most erroneously treated by Mr. Sewell and the Tract writers. It is the all-important one of sinful man’s pardon or justification before God. This surpasses all others in magnitude and interest. Other questions become of more or less moment in proportion as they bear, and throw light, on this. It is one which must, soon or late, engage the attention of every one who would not leave the present world without being prepared for the future. Ignorance or deception on this point, being attended with fatal consequences, it is here that Mr. Sewell and his friends are liable to the heaviest charge, and a fearful responsibility. On this point they have done all that in them lay, to obscure and pervert the plain scriptural doctrines of the Established

Church, and to put out of sight, and to weaken, or rather to supersede, the authority of holy scripture itself. Their having done this in ignorance, or because they are themselves under a delusion, furnishes no defence or excuse in the sight of God. Whosoever, possessing the advantage of access to the Bible, continues ignorant, is so because he loves darkness rather than light; and, on the highest authority, we are assured that this is the condemnation of such parties.* This holds good more especially in the case of those who are ministers of religion, and who volunteer to be leaders and lights in their day and generation. It is on no light or questionable grounds that so grave a charge is brought against these writers: their publications furnish ample evidence of its truth and correctness.

The charge against them is, that they have perverted and falsified the doctrine of the Established Church and of holy Scripture, on the subject of sinful man's justification before God. The obvious mode of proving this charge is to place the doctrines of the Church and of Scripture in juxtaposition with the writings of these gentlemen. Attend, first, to the doctrine of the Church.

“XI. *Article of the Justification of Man.*

“We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,

* John iii. 19.

by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”

Although this Article is full and clear on the question, yet, as it refers to the Homily, it may be satisfactory to adduce a quotation or two from it.

“ Because all be sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of his law and commandments, therefore can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds, seem they never so good, be justified and made righteous before God : but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness of justification, to be received at God’s own hands ; that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and trespasses, in such things as he hath offended. And this justification or righteousness, which we so receive of God’s mercy and Christ’s merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification. For the full understanding hereof, it is our parts and duties ever to remember the great mercy of God : how that all the world being wrapped in sin by breaking of the law, God sent his only Son our Saviour Christ into the world, to fulfil the law for us ; and, by shedding his most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or, as it may be called, amends to his Father, for our sins, to assuage his wrath and indignation conceived

against us for the same. This is that justification of which St. Paul speaketh, when he saith, We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law ; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.”—“ His great mercy he showed us, in delivering us from our former captivity (to the devil) without requiring any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made on our parts ; which thing by us had been impossible to be done. And whereas it lay not in us to do that, he provided a ransom for us ; that was the most precious body and blood of his own most dear and beloved Son Jesus Christ, who, besides this ransom, fulfilled the law for us perfectly. And so the justice of God and his mercy did embrace together, and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption.*

Such is the doctrine of our Church as to sinful man’s pardon. It sets forth, 1st, that we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of Christ by faith, and not for works or deservings of our own, because we all are sinners and breakers of God’s law : 2nd, that the righteousness of our Saviour’s merits is accepted of God for our perfect justification ; 3rd, that all being wrapped in sin, God in his mercy sent Christ to fulfil the law for us ; and, by shedding his most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction for us ; and 4th,

* Homily on Salvation.

that all this becomes ours through faith in Christ ; or, in the words of St. Paul, that we are justified by the faith of Christ.

Now hear Mr. Sewell in his *Christian Morals*. “ This original sin, (of an infant,) *as well as the shame of real actual guilt*, the Church cleanses away by baptism, typifies the fact by ablution with water, restores the mind to the consciousness of purity, enables it to look up even to God himself with an open, uncowering eye.” Again : “ There is another observation to be made respecting the Catholic doctrine of the union of man with God through the sacraments of the Church. When the Church declares that baptism cleanses from the stain of sin, and makes us at that sacrament pure and acceptable, justified and righteous in the sight of God, we might very justly be content with its proving that God himself had sanctioned such a declaration, and not require to know the way in which the work of justification was accomplished. But when this question is asked, it is answered by the same fact of our being by baptism united to Christ.”

Attend next to the Oxford Tracts on this subject. “ This may be set down as the very essence of sectarian doctrine, to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the instrument of justification and other gospel gifts.” Again : “ Justification consists in the habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word incarnate through the Holy Ghost.

Neither the imputed righteousness of Christ, nor imparted nor inherent righteousness, is the constituting nor formal cause of justification, or that in which a justified state consists, but a gift which includes both of these, and is greater than either, viz. the actual presence in a mysterious way, or indwelling in the soul, through the Spirit, of the word incarnate, in whom is the Father.” Again: “The prevailing notion of bringing forward the atonement explicitly and prominently on all occasions is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture; nor do we find any sanction for it in the Gospels. If the Epistles of St. Paul appear to favour it, it is only at first sight. If the doctrine of the atonement is conveyed in the expression, Christ crucified, as used by St. Paul, it is by teaching, at the same time, the necessity of our mortification. It is expressing our Saviour’s declaration, he that cometh after me, must take up his cross daily and follow me. They both imply that we cannot approach God acceptably without a sacrifice on the part of human nature, in union with that of our Saviour.”

These are but scanty specimens of the awful perversion of the great doctrine of a sinner’s justification and pardon, which pervades the whole series of the writings put forth by Mr. Sewell and his friends. The contradiction between it and what we have adduced from our Church standards, is direct and obvious. In the one, Christ’s merits or righ-

teousness and his atonement are laid down as the foundation of forgiveness and acceptance ; in the other, both are excluded, as by Mr. Sewell ; or, as by the Tract writers, slightly and disparagingly introduced, and another thing substituted for them. According to the former, original and actual sin are washed away by baptism. By it we become pure, acceptable, justified, and righteous in the sight of God. According to the latter, neither imputed nor any other righteousness justifies ; but “ the actual presence in a mysterious way, or indwelling in the soul, through the spirit of the Word incarnate, in whom is the Father.” That which this incomprehensible phraseology conveys is substituted for the atonement, which, it seems, it is unscriptural to bring forward explicitly and prominently. Our Church, in the language of St. Paul, teaches that it is by faith we are justified. This these writers boldly contradict, asserting it to be the essence of sectarianism to consider faith as the instrument of justification, whereas it is all done by the sacraments : thus absolutely fixing the charge of sectarianism upon St. Paul.

In comparing Mr. Sewell’s doctrine of pardon and that of our Church, statements from Scripture have been introduced : but as this has been done only incidentally and partially, it becomes necessary, in a question of such paramount importance, to be more distinct and explicit. The subject is expressly set forth and explained by St.

Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. In the first chapters of that epistle he shows that all mankind are sinners, and as such condemned before God. By a full induction of particulars, he proves this in the case of the two great classes of mankind, viz. the Jews, and the Gentiles as they are called, or the other nations, as contradistinguished from the Jews. From this he draws the necessary conclusion, “that by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified;—for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” An appeal to the divine law, instead of justifying us, discovers to us, and fastens upon us, our sin. Having thus cut off all hope of acceptance with God on the ground of any work or merit of ours, he sets forth, in the following verses, the ground of hope furnished by the divine compassion and mercy. “But now the righteousness of God, without the law,” (independent of our merits) “is manifested,” (made known to us in the Gospel,) “being witnessed by the law and the prophets.” (It is no imposture or novelty; it was formerly, in the Old Testament, borne witness to by the law and the prophets.) “Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ,” (the obedience or conformity to the divine law which God has provided for us, consisting of the obedience and holy life of our Saviour, which becomes ours through faith,) “unto all and upon all them that believe,” (investing and covering them as a garment.) “For there is no difference; for all have

sinned and come short of the glory of God : being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God : to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness ; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”* A verse in a following chapter throws light on the expression “ righteousness,” used in this passage. It is the following : “ As by one man’s disobedience” (Adam’s disobedience) “ many were made sinners,” (all Adam’s children, all mankind, were made sinners,) “ so by the obedience of one” (Christ’s obedience or righteousness) “ shall many be made righteous,” (all Christ’s children, all who shall, through divine mercy, be made the children of Christ by faith in him.) The plain truth is, then, briefly this. We have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God, and are alike under condemnation. Our heavenly Father has sent his blessed Son (who was God manifest in the flesh !) to be a Redeemer and a propitiation for sin. He obeyed and died ; his death takes away the guilt, and cancels the debt ; and his obedience, or merits, becomes the possession and righteousness of all that come to him by faith ; i. e. of all who, guided by the Holy Spirit, take refuge at the foot of the cross. We

* Romans iii. 20.

become “the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” Such is the Scripture doctrine of justification ; that of our Church is the same.

Mr. Sewell has the following very remarkable passage towards the close of his *Christian Morals*. “If God has been pleased to appoint that man shall be his instrument and agent in conveying his blessings to mankind, and we choose to slight and despise man, and insist on communicating with God, the Sovereign of the universe, without the intervention of his ministers, to hope for blessings from other channels invented by ourselves, to intrude on him without introduction or permission, may it not be, that our very worship may become a profanation, and our prayer be turned into a curse ?”

He here plainly discourages us from approaching God in worship and prayer, and teaches that it is only through the channel of the ministers of the Church we have any warrant to hope for blessings from God ; nay, he goes the length of intimating, very unequivocally, that if we intrude on God, our worship may become a profanation, and our prayer a curse. There is here a plain and direct contradiction of the word of God. St. Paul says,* “Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.” We are commanded to come ourselves to God’s throne of grace ; yea, to come boldly. The command is addressed to us as sinners, worthless and helpless, as appears from the

* Heb. iv. 16.

nature of the blessings which we are to receive, viz. mercy and grace to help us. Is it through the introduction of the minister we are to come, or under his auspices, or with his intervention or mediation? No; for such purposes we need him not, as the apostle shows in the preceding verses: “Seeing that we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” It is, then, because we have the intervention and mediation of this great High Priest, that, without man’s intervention, we are to come boldly unto the throne of grace. This is further explained by St. Paul in a following chapter. * “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith.” Formerly, under the Mosaic dispensation, the priest alone presented and offered the sacrifices of the people, and none, except the high priest, entered into the innermost and most holy part of the temple: but this system, with its bondage, exclusions, and various disadvantages, passed away at the death of our Saviour.

* Heb. x. 14.

When he bowed his head on the cross, and gave up the ghost, the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the most holy part of it laid open, and its contents were disclosed; signifying to us, that, thenceforward, its priesthood and services were abolished; that there was to be one High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, who had entered with the blood of his own all-prevalent sacrifice into heaven, there to appear in the presence of God for us; and, inasmuch as he ever liveth to make intercession for us, we may now, all of us, each believer in his own person, come, through him, with boldness unto the throne of grace! What a fearful responsibility does he incur, then, who dares to contradict all this? Who, when the word of God says, "Come boldly to the throne of grace," tells the people that, coming without human intervention, their "worship may be profanation, and their prayers a curse." This is priestcraft in one of its worst and most disgusting forms.*

Mr. Sewell's instruction for acquiring knowledge in christian morals, has, at least, the attraction of novelty to recommend it. It might be supposed that the moral law contained in God's commandments, would be laid as the foundation of any

* For some valuable remarks bearing on this subject, and showing also the distinction between the Christian minister, the Presbyterian, and the sacrificing priest—the Hiereus, see "Essays on the Errors of Romanism," by Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin.

system of morals which a christian divine would recommend ; especially when that divine occupied a professor's chair in a Protestant university, where among the students are large numbers designed for the christian ministry. It might also, not unreasonably, be expected that the illustration of that system should be drawn from the divine teaching of our Saviour, and that his spotless life would be held forth as the grand exemplar of all goodness, excellence, and purity in christian morals. It would doubtless be quite legitimate in a university lecturer to introduce the ancient sages and philosophers. Indeed, their exclusion would involve the neglect of an important duty of his office, viz. the exposure of their ignorance and incompetency as moral teachers, as proved both by their doctrines and lives. A christian lecturer would be careful to point out the false principles and utter inefficacy of the very best of the ancient systems, and prove his position by an appeal to the writings and practice of the chief philosophers.*

* Plato and Aristotle are Mr. Sewell's chief favourites among the Greeks. Take the following specimen of their morals as regards truth and falsehood. Plato says, " Good is better than truth ; and among the gods they are conjoined with each other ; but in their participants, they are often separated, and good is produced through falsehood, and truth is frustrated of good. Whence also Socrates himself, when he is forming laws for the guardians of his Republic, orders falsehood to be employed—the stupid not being otherwise capable of obtaining the good which is adapted to their condition."

He would draw forth in bright contrast to their ignorance and sin, the clear, comprehensive and pure summary of the divine law given by our Saviour when he said, "The first and great commandment is this, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart: and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" a summary which brings it to the level of every capacity. And for the amplification and details of this we might expect that he would appeal to the apostle. * "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute

Aristotle follows his master: he says, "He who is a lover of truth, and speaketh the truth in things of no consequence, whether he does so or not, will, in a still greater degree, speak the truth in things in which it is of consequence. If, however, he does this (speak falsely in exaggeration) for the sake of something, such as glory or honour, he is not very blameable. But if for the sake of money, he is more base."

As for the practice, even of the most celebrated of the philosophers, it is represented, by their historians, as most depraved.

* Rom. xii. 8.

you : bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things ; but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath. For it is written, Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord : therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink : for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." That is, by so doing thou shalt, by the warmth of thy kindness, soften and convert him into a friend : or, as the next verse expresses it, " Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Thou shalt subdue his evil by thy good, and assimilate him to thyself. Here are true christian morals ! Alas ! that Mr. Sewell should seek for them elsewhere. He is, however, an original thinker, and he takes a different course. The following extracts will show the course which he has preferred.

" And now I have suggested to you two great truths, which must be laid down as the foundation of the study of ethics : first, that in prosecuting that study, you must take the Catholic Church as your guide ; secondly, that you must also borrow

the assistance of the great heathen writers of antiquity."

Again : after informing his readers, that if they would read the Bible, as reasonable and inquiring beings, they must take the great doctrines of Christianity, as given in the creeds and catechisms of the Church, and observe how they occur in every page ; he adds, " So also study ethics. Take from Aristotle and from Plato, where they are sanctioned by the Church, their fundamental axioms of morals. Trace these axioms in all their phenomena before you. Read them in history ; develope them in art ; follow them into the minute delineations of private character and of common life. If they are true, you will find them everywhere. You will delight in the pursuit, innocently and inexhaustibly. You will use reason without abusing it. You will confirm, instead of destroying belief."

Again : " History and legislation, and economy, and art, and philosophy, and poetry, and metaphysics, even the sciences of matter, as correlatives to the faculties of the mind, are to form a part of your moral studies. If you attempt to restrict them to what an ignorant age calls *moral*,—that is, to laws against murder, theft, adultery, and false witness,—you will know little of the depth of their meaning ; and morals will be to you as a slip of knowledge, torn from its parent stem, and planted in a barren soil. No man ever penetrated far into any

study, but he was carried up at last into principles which are the source of all others; and no man ever studied wisely, who stopped short of these depths. If you are afraid of depth, if you think that general principles are useless, because to be stated generally they assume an abstract and mysterious character; if you will deal only with what shallow-minded men call *practical* questions—as if anything could be practical which is not founded on truth, or anything could be true which, if expressed in all its fulness, would not seem a mystery and a problem, you are not a fit person to study morals, or any other science. Nature has intended you for a drudge, and not for a leader; to obey others, without knowing why or wherefore. Be content with this: it is all you are fit for. And if you attempt to reason, you will only reason wrongly, and aid in bringing down the human mind to a poor and degraded vulgarity, both of thought and action. And be assured you will do infinite mischief. Men are sick of the shallow, superficial, meagre speculations which these *practical* notions have engendered. They want depth, and mystery, and vastness. If they cannot find them in a true system, they will seek them in a false.”

This is, indeed, a new course which Mr. Sewell has marked out for himself, as a teacher of christian morals. He takes a distinction between the doctrines of Christianity and morals. For the former

we are to go to the creeds and catechisms, and then observe how they occur in every page of the Bible. But in the business of morals, the Bible is to be left out of sight. We must take our fundamental axioms from Plato and Aristotle, and follow them up in history, legislation, economy, art, philosophy, poetry, and metaphysics; even the science of matter is to form a part of our moral studies; including, no doubt, anatomy, chemistry, botany, astronomy, and geology. What prodigious capacity and powers must Mr. Sewell's moralist possess, and what an accomplished person must he be! How foolishly have we supposed that morality concerned all;—young and old, rich and poor, high and low, learned and unlearned; and, therefore, that its rules should be full, clear, and intelligible to all who are under obligation to obey them: that morality is something practical. This, it seems, is what an ignorant age and shallow-minded men call morals;—laws against murders, thefts, adultery, false witness, and such like. True morality has depth, vastness, and mystery. It is a problem which the vulgar cannot solve, and far above the comprehension of those who are satisfied with the shallow, meagre, superficial speculations which practical notions have engendered. Is any one at a loss to understand all this? Is it too vast, deep, and mysterious, for the grasp of his intellect? O happy and enviable bewilderment! That person is a most accomplished and first-rate moralist!

The false doctrine and various errors of Mr. Sewell, which have been exposed, can attain currency only so far as they are kept out of the light of Holy Scripture. Let them be brought to the test of that word, and it will appear at once that they are counterfeit. It is accordingly a great object with that gentleman and the Tract writers to weaken, and in a great degree to supersede, the authority of Scripture, and to substitute for it the teaching of the Church and its traditions, and the doctrines of the, so called, Fathers. Attend to the language of Mr. Sewell. “For revelation, we must go to the apostles; for communication with the apostles, we must go to the Catholic Church. And thus our ancestors, who cleared away from our own system the corruptions of Popery, did fall back on the witness of those good and wise men who lived fifteen hundred years ago; and we must do so likewise.”

Again: “Such are the grounds on which a minister of the Church would claim, or ought to claim, to stand over you, the boy, or young man, who is now reading this book, as your teacher and guide, in the pursuit of your happiness and goodness. He has truths, higher than man can reach, which you must learn—truths communicated by God to Christ, by Christ to his apostles, by the apostles to the Catholic Church, by the Catholic Church to our forefathers, from these passed on to the present generation, in this

generation set before you by the ministers whom the Church has appointed. And they have powers mysterious and awful, which no human being could of himself pretend to possess ; which, through the same regular channel, successively derived from Christ, he will now exercise towards you, in making you what you ought to be, wise, and good, and happy."

Again : " God's commands alone can form a stable, unshaken foundation for our moral belief : and, by revelation, through the Catholic Church, we possess these commands ; and by no other channel which is not tainted, and rendered suspicious and variable by a mixture of human opinions. Draw your notions of God's commands from your reason, and your reason may logically err ; from your conscience, and your conscience is too often the voice of your own corrupt desires ; from calculations of expediency, and how can you sum up the items ? From human laws, and, as human, they are fallible ; from general sentiments, and they also are human, and the majority of men are not wise and good, but ignorant and bad ; from the declarations of a self-chosen teacher, as in popery, but your choice will be as erroneous, as your own moral character is defective ; from the *Bible*, but the interpretation of the *Bible*, if left to your own inferences, will be tinged with your own inclinations, perplexed with your own ignorance, mixed by your own false judg-

ment. One more clear criterion remains—the real, clear voice of God, attested by his appointed ministers, and preserved, not only in the written word, but in the *traditionary creeds, rituals, and history of the Catholic Church.* And thus in morals, as in theology, Catholicity is the criterion of truth, and the first teacher to which we must have recourse.”

To multiply quotations from Mr. Sewell is needless. To set the matter at rest, Dr. Miller, in his correspondence with him, lately published in Ireland, put to him the following plain question: “Whether he refers church principles to any other authority than the written word of God?” In answering this simple question, Mr. Sewell occupies four columns in a closely-printed journal. This space he covers, in misrepresenting the opinions of others, in describing and exaggerating prevalent errors, in complicating the question, in attempts to evade it, and in quibbling about it. At last he informs us that the Apostles’ Creed is acknowledged to be true, and, at least in its substance, apostolical; and that the same two sources of instruction, the written word, and the teaching of the Church, are recognised combinedly. But opinions differ as to the order in which they are to be placed. Must we go first to the Scriptures, and then to the Creeds; or first to the Creeds, and then to the Scriptures? Is reason to be exercised by Christians, in discovering truth, from the Bible, which they are not previously taught by the

Church, or in proving what they have been taught? Is the Apostles' Creed, which we all believe to be a correct summary of apostolic teaching, a human deduction from Scripture, or a catholic tradition from the apostles? Was not such a summary a necessary part of the apostolical teaching, and do not the Scriptures themselves intimate the existence of it? Have we not reason to believe that we possess it, with sufficient accuracy, in the, so called, Apostles' Creed, though the exact words are not guaranteed to us? And if we possess it, are we not bound, and does not the Church of England bind us, to employ it, according to the ordinary practice of all teaching; giving to the young, first, the simple, general declarations of gospel truths, and then leading on the mind to see them expounded, confirmed, and illustrated in the more copious forms of the Scriptures? And if this be true, what becomes of the principle of placing Christians by themselves to discover the truth in the Bible, either first or only? Even if the Creed were a human deduction from Scripture, might not the recognized authority of the Church be sufficient to justify our employing it as we do and must employ it? These are some of the questions which have been, or may be mooted, but not with any thought of detracting from the dignity, but rather to increase a true reverence for, and a right use of, that written word, which is a light to our feet and a lantern to our path. Is not the present question this—not whether one

or other is to be held exclusively ; but granting that both are good, in what order are they to be employed ? Is it the Christian's duty to confirm the Scripture by the Creed, or the Creed by the Scripture ?”

Although Mr. Sewell did not intend to answer Dr. Miller's question so as to let out his real opinion, that opinion is sufficiently indicated by the inquiry,—“Are we to confirm the Scripture by the Creed, or the Creed by the Scripture?” No man who had just views of the Scriptures, viz. “that all scripture is given by inspiration of God,” would presume to ask such a question. How can Mr. Sewell honestly call himself a minister of the Established Church, and propose this question ? Has he never read the eighth Article, which distinctly states, that “the three Creeds, the Nicene, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles' Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed : for they may be *proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture*. After having solemnly professed that he believes this Article, he, a reformer of religion and a reprover of his brethren, stands forth and inquires if we are to confirm the Scripture by the Creed !

The following extracts from the Oxford Tracts will further exhibit the views of those gentlemen on this subject :

“It may be urged that we Protestants believe the Scriptures to contain the whole rule of duty.—

Certainly not. They constitute a rule of faith, not a rule of practice. Where are we told in Scripture that gambling is wrong, or suicide ?”

Again : “Catholicity is the only test of truth. With respect to the supreme authority of inspired Scripture, it stands thus : Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth : Scripture proves it. Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it. The true creed is the catholic interpretation of Scripture, or scripturally proved tradition. Scripture and tradition taken together are the joint rule of faith.”

Again : “Revelation is found both in Scripture and antiquity.”

Again : “To impugn tradition is blasphemy.”

Again : “The authority of the Church is embodied in its articles of faith. They are as much an integral part of the christian dispensation as the Bible itself.”

Again : “Where shall we find him, who is truth itself, more assuredly than in the catholic consent of his Church ?”

In fine, the Tract writers describe the whole Bible
AS ONE GREAT PARABLE.

What is all this but an impious attempt to set aside the Word of God, and to substitute for it something which they call the authority of the Catholic Church, and antiquity, and tradition ? Ask them where is this something to be found ? They have no answer to give to this plain question. It is consistent in the Church of Rome to come

forward with authority, and claim the office of defining, and explaining, and giving supplementary doctrine. They have the Pope, and the Cardinals, and the Councils as the depository, or pretended depository, of their tradition. But what has the Church of England to offer? Nothing. They talk of the Fathers. On what ground can they pretend that any authority belongs to the Fathers? Is anything to be found in Scripture which warrants such a notion? No; they do not attempt to show anything of the kind. Such an attempt, indeed, would be inconsistent with their theory, that the Fathers confirm Scripture, or, at least, are of equal authority with it. Is the appeal to the Fathers founded on the sobriety, consistency, truth, and excellence of their works? The Fathers have no such qualities to recommend them. There were, doubtless, among the earlier of them, men of God, who held divine truth as set forth in Scripture, and sealed it with their blood. But they did, notwithstanding, one and all, without a single exception, exhibit in their writings such traits of puerility and various weaknesses and errors, as deprive them of all respect and confidence, as authoritative teachers; and such as, even though there were nothing else to do it, would separate them, by a broad line of distinction, from the apostles.* Or is it on the

* It would be endless to cite all the evidences which might be adduced, of the puerilities and errors of the Fathers. Let the following, from the writings of three of the most celebrated of them,

ground that they were better qualified than we are to understand the sacred writings, that we are to

be taken as a specimen. The first is taken from the writings of Clemens Romanus, the companion of St. Paul. In it he argues on the existence of the fabulous bird, the phoenix, and does so to prove and illustrate the doctrine of the resurrection.

“Let us consider that wonderful type of the resurrection which is seen in the eastern countries; that is to say, in Arabia. There is a certain bird called a phoenix; of this there is never but one at a time, and that lives five hundred years; and, when the time of its dissolution draws near that it must die, it makes itself a nest of frankincense, and myrrh, and other spices; into which, when its time is fulfilled, it enters, and dies. But its flesh, putrefying, breeds a certain worm, which, being nourished with the juice of the dead bird, brings forth feathers, and, when it is grown to a perfect state, it takes up the nest in which the bones of its parent lie, and carries it from Arabia into Egypt, to a city called Heliopolis: and, flying in open day, in the sight of all men, lays it upon the altar of the sun, and so returns from whence it came. The priests then search into the records of time, and find that it returned precisely at the end of five hundred years.”

The second extract is taken from the writings of Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, but one step removed from the apostles.

Irenæus says, “There were four evangelists, and no more—because there were only four seasons of the year.”

The third is taken from Ignatius, who suffered martyrdom in the year 107, in the reign of Trajan.

Ignatius says to his friend, “I beseech you show not an unreasonable goodwill towards me, but suffer me to be food to the wild beasts, by whom I shall attain to God; encourage them, that they may become my sepulchre. May I enjoy the wild beasts that are prepared for me: may they exercise their fierceness on me; and for that end, I will encourage them that they may devour me.”

Now compare with this wild desire of martyrdom, the wisdom

follow them ? This is an empty claim which cannot be established. On the contrary, it may be boldly maintained, that, in this respect, we have greatly the advantage of them. Some of the Fathers, indeed the majority of them, knew nothing of Hebrew, the original language of the Old Testament. And as for a right understanding of the Greek original of the New Testament, our advantages for a critical examination of it, far surpass theirs : and accordingly, whoever will examine the Commentaries they have left, will find them much inferior to those more recently produced. Some, indeed, rest the claim of the earliest of the Fathers on their having been contemporaries of the apostles, and conversant with them, and as having, in consequence, superior opportunities of understanding their doctrines. What ! superior to those who have the apostles' own writings unfolding their doctrines ? Let us suppose a case. Here are three credible persons who inform us, that, on a certain important matter, they had a conversation, shortly before his death, with the late Emperor Napoleon. Each of these three persons gives his version of the

and sobriety of Scripture, teaching us that, while we should patiently submit to the will of God, if he should call us to suffer for his name's sake, we are still to use all proper means for the preservation of our lives. Christ says, " When they persecute you in this city, flee into another." (Matt. x. 23.) " The Lord stood with me, and strengthened me ; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion : and the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom." 2 Tim. iv. 16.

conversation, and presents to us also certain notes which he had taken of it at the time. They vary, though not materially, from each other ; and as accuracy is of importance, we set ourselves to collate their several manuscripts. While we are so employed, a fourth person comes forward, who tells us that he has the custody of Napoleon's papers, and presents to us one in his handwriting, and authenticated by his signature, detailing, in all its parts, the matter in question. How do we act ? We dismiss the three witnesses, we throw aside their notes, and we take Napoleon's own communication as a full, complete, and authentic document of what he had designed to communicate. This is the precise case as to the Scriptures and the Fathers. The three witnesses, with their conversations and notes, are the Fathers : Napoleon's own manuscript, authenticated by his signature, represents the Scripture. The only difference is, that the Scriptures came to us authenticated by the stamp and impress of Heaven.

What is the language of the Fathers themselves on the subject of tradition and the authority of the Church ? Hear Cyprian, who lived early in the third century. Referring to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, who had pleaded tradition in support of his errors, he says, " What does he mean by tradition ? Does he mean the authority of Christ in the gospels, and of the apostles in the epistles ? Let *this tradition* be sacred : for if we return to this head

and original of Divine tradition, human error will cease."

Hear Augustine : " You are accustomed to object against us the letters and judgments of councils and fathers. Now who knows not that the holy and canonical Scripture is confined solely to the Old and New Testament : and in this it is distinguished from the writings of all bishops, that no doubt or dispute whatever is to be heard about the sacred Scripture, as to the truth and right of anything contained in the same. But the letters of bishops may be reprehended or corrected."

Such is the language of two of the best of the Fathers. Similar expressions pervade the writings of many others of them. In fact, tradition was first appealed to in support of new doctrines, not to be found in Scripture, and of the heresies introduced at an early period into the Christian Church. When we find St. Paul cautioning the Christians of his day against false teachers, who were then among them, and stating that the "mystery of iniquity" was already at work, we are not surprised to find that no fewer than ninety different heresies sprang up in the course of the first three centuries. Why is it that Mr. Sewell and the Oxford writers would now carry us back to tradition, and throw us on what they call the authority of the Catholic Church ? It is because their new doctrine, their Anti-Protestant doctrine, not only has no support in the Word of God, but is condemned by it.

They would bolster it up by the authority of the Fathers. And yet what does Mr. Sewell say respecting the writings of their day? He actually acknowledges that "there was a wholesale forgery of them in the third and fourth century!" An acknowledgment for which we are probably indebted to the notoriety of the fact. Whole treatises, *spurious*, were put forth in the name of the most distinguished Fathers, to procure currency for them.* Besides these, the manuscripts of the Fathers have been, in numerous places, designedly corrupted; and, ever since the introduction of the art of printing, their writings have been mutilated by papal advocates, and by the expurgatory indexes of the Church of Rome.† But even though they were all genuine, are they accessible? Are they such as that all interested in the knowledge of divine truth can read and judge of them? One collection of the Fathers of the Latin church, the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, consists of twenty-eight volumes in folio; and this is exclusive of the Fathers of the Asiatic and African churches, which form a library in themselves. A whole life would be insufficient, setting all other obstacles aside, to

* See Daillé, *du vrai usage des Pères*.

† Pamele, an archdeacon of the Church of Rome, and editor of the works of Cyprian, says, "*Cypriani scripta, et aliorum veterum, a librariis, variè fuisse interpolata.*" Du Pin gives an account, corroborative of this, of the Roman edition of Ambrose's works.

wade through such a mass. And yet this is what Mr. Sewell and his friends would substitute for the Scriptures, or give us as an explanation of them. Or is it not rather their sinister design, by setting before the people an impracticable work, to tempt them to the readier course of blindly following the clergy as their guides, instead of drinking in divine truth from the “wells of salvation,” the word of God: or, in other words, instead of proving all things, and holding fast that which is good?

Let the people of this country beware of all attempts to draw them away from the holy Scripture, or to diminish their reverence for it, or to persuade them that anything can be safely substituted in its stead. Attend to the Article of our Church.

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.”

The Article harmonizes with the statements of God’s word, concerning its own paramount authority, usefulness, and importance. St. Paul, commending Timothy, “that, from a child he had

known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," adds, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."* David says, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my paths."† Again, "The entrance of thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple."‡ Our Saviour commands the Jews to "search the Scriptures."§ It is particularly to be remembered, that, to add to the holy Scriptures, or to take away from them, is, in various parts of them, described as an accursed thing, against which the divine vengeance is threatened. || If it be criminal to take away a part of them, how tenfold aggravated must be the criminality of subtracting from the authority of the whole, or of superseding the use of them, by substituting some other teacher in their stead, or, by exalting something else as of paramount authority!

* 2 Tim. iii. 14, 15.

† Psalm cxix. 105.

‡ Psalm cxix. 130.

§ John v. 39. It may be objected, that the Greek word *ερευνare* may be translated as an indicative, as well as an imperative. This is true. But it makes no difference, as our Saviour evidently speaks of the practice of searching the Scriptures with approbation.

|| Deut. iv. 2, and xii. 32. Prov. xxx. 5. Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

The statement of St. Paul, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," is explained by the apostle Peter, when he says, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." * Is it reasonable to suppose that a book, thus indited under the inspiration of God, written by persons who were moved by the Holy Ghost, a book designed for the purpose of instructing and enlightening us in the doctrine of our Saviour, or, as itself expresses it, "to make us wise unto salvation," is obscure and incomprehensible, and must be useless, except communicated through human interpreters? What! cannot God teach us, cannot he reach our heart? Away with the notion. It is at once impious, and an outrage upon common sense. There are, doubtless, mysteries in the Gospel; such as the divine perfections and nature. "Who by searching can find out God?" And also the union of the divine and human nature in him who was "God manifest in the flesh!" And again, the influences of the Holy Spirit on the human mind. But these are mysteries from the very nature of them, and from our finite and limited capacity: and can never be made less mysterious by any human teaching. They are as much mysteries to the most accomplished and acute philosopher, as to the peasant: and we are to receive them, because they come to us on the authority of God, and in connexion with

* 2 Peter i. 21.

the work of our blessed Saviour ! These mysteries, then, derogate not from the value and authority of Scripture.

God grant that England may ever remember the words of Chillingworth : “ The religion of Protestants is the Bible ! The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants ! Whatsoever they believe, besides it, and the plain irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold as matter of *opinion* ; but as matter of *faith* and *religion*, neither can they, with coherence to their own grounds, believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.”

I now take my leave of Mr. Sewell’s “ Christian Morals.” In what an extraordinary light is the minister of religion presented to us in this work, and in the Oxford Tracts ! What various novel and portentous functions does he discharge ! You see him, at one time, opening his mouth to pray for the dead, and at another, to anathematize the living. You see him now, at the baptismal font, forgiving sins, imparting the Holy Ghost, and casting out the devil ; and presently at the communion table, giving to the people the real body and blood of our Saviour, along with the bread and wine. You see him, with one hand closing the Bible, while with the other he scatters firebrands among the Dissenters, Protestants, and Roman Catholics. The mere recital of such functions

borders on impiety, and cannot be made without shuddering !*

I have now to advert to an article in the Quarterly Review for last December, entitled, “ Romanism in Ireland,” of which Mr. Sewell is the undoubted author. He has unreservedly avowed it, in large circles here and in Ireland. He has also avowed the authorship of a second review, under the same title, published in the same work, in its last number. And it is notorious that he has been in Ireland, within the last month, (I saw him myself in Trinity College, Dublin, a few days ago,) collecting materials for another article on the same subject. The article in question has been attributed to him, without contradiction, in the public journals, here and in Ireland. This is, therefore, one of those cases in which the incognito has been thrown off, and the known author may be treated as if he were the *publicly* avowed one.

* It may be truly said that Mr. Sewell, in his Christian Morals, has set before us “both bane and antidote.” If he has written a bad book, he has written one so dull and tiresome, so desultory, rambling, and full of episodes, the connexion of which with the main subject no one but himself can discover, that not one out of ten who begin it, will read it through; and of those who do, not one out of ten will discover (I will not say his system, for he does not know that himself, but) half the mischief it contains. I read, and read, till my head became like a smokejack ; and at last I rose from the perusal, bewildered, in a kind of stupid astonishment how any human patience could suffice to write a book, the reading of which scarcely any human patience can endure.

This article has been considered by some, I am aware, as having a political aspect, and as intended to answer a political purpose. Having examined it carefully, I cannot say that it may not bear such a construction. At the same time, it is so framed, that I can well understand, that, however others may interpret it, the sole object of its author may have been a religious one. If it has a political tendency and object, the few remarks which I have to offer will leave that tendency and object untouched and unaffected. My remarks will bear on the subject of religion, and on that, chiefly as it respects the Established Church of Ireland, and the Irish clergy.

A note appended to one of its pages much impressed me, and I certainly received from it unexpected information. This note explains, if not the origin, at least the progress of extemporaneous prayer in this country, and of meetings for such purposes. They owe their origin, or at least their advancement, to certain Romish priests, it seems, sent from Rome in the year 1646, to spread Popery amongst us, though they pretended to be sectarians. This is a very alarming discovery. It places extempore prayer and prayer-meetings in a new light. We are, in this country, a people easily duped. I now find that I have myself been under a delusion in this matter. It happened that, some seven or eight years ago, I spent the autumn in Brighton. One evening I walked out of the

town, and ascending the hill on which the old church stands, I wandered two or three miles into the country, until the increasing darkness reminded me of the necessity of returning. As I retraced my steps, the twilight-calm and the quiet around me, contrasted with the lights, bustle, sounds of distant music, and other noises from the town below, impressed my mind. As I passed through a little hamlet, consisting of a few very poor cottages, I saw a light in one of the lower windows of one of them, and I heard a sound as from persons singing. I approached the window, part of which was open, and I saw some ten or twelve people, men and women, like farm-labourers and their wives, standing round the room, and engaged in singing a hymn. When they had finished the hymn, which they sang with much appearance of feeling, they all knelt down, and an old man offered up a prayer to the Divine Being, with fervour and devotion. It was short and simple ; he confessed sin, and implored pardon and acceptance, through the death and merits of our Saviour : he returned thanks for mercies, and besought continued grace and guidance, and the Divine blessing for themselves, their families, and neighbours. I withdrew from the window, much affected by what I had witnessed : I felt my own heart raised towards heaven by the simple devotions of these poor people. It occurred to me, that here was true religion : that these poor people, closing their daily labour thus, must be

good parents, good servants, good members of society ; and this suggested to me, that probably, in various parts of our land, thousands of our labouring peasantry were, like these persons, under the influence of true religion ; and that this, amidst many unfavourable signs of our times, was a good sign that Almighty God still designed to protect and bless our country. I am now sensible of my weakness, and confess my folly. This was, no doubt, a party of Papists, and the old man who prayed was probably a Jesuit, and their sole object was to set up Popery at Brighton ! What a valuable discovery is this of Mr. Sewell's, and what obligations are we under to him for putting us on our guard against extempore prayers and prayer-meetings ! By the way, here is a sure way of catching Jesuits, and such dangerous people, and disturbers of the public peace. Why should the government search after Chartists, or the Conservatives engage in the fruitless task of opening up the mysteries of Maynooth. Let them unite, and direct their energies against extempore prayer and prayer-meetings ; at such meetings they shall certainly catch all the bad characters they are in search of. And here it occurs to me, what would have been the state of Ireland, if the Romish priests had carried into that country the device of teaching the people to sing hymns and pray extempore ? Let us figure to ourselves a gang of Ribbon-men, or Whiteboys, met at night to burn, and rob, and murder, and

commencing their procedure with hymn-singing and prayers ! One of them stands up when they assemble, and gives out a hymn, (just as the old Papist did at Brighton,) and having sung it, they kneel down, and another of them prays extempore : and then they all rise up, and one of them says, Boys, are your pistols ready ? It is time to set out to burn Paddy M'Keown's house, and to murder his wife and children. Can we be at any loss to suppose what the effect of this speech would be on those who had, the moment before, sung a hymn and prayed extempore ? But we need not alarm ourselves as to the probable effect, since the Ribbon-men and Whiteboys are not as yet addicted to hymn-singing and extempore prayer.

Mr. Sewell expresses a strong apprehension of the probable growth of Popery. " Never," he says, " was there a time more favourable to the growth of Popery, or more likely to witness its triumph, than a disorganized, latitudinarian, infidel, dissenting, luxurious, and self-willed age, calling itself enlightened." Here a number of hard and rather discordant names are applied to the present times. We are not, however, disposed to quarrel with them. He adds, " the very spirit of this age, especially in matters of religion, is Papistical." In what other thing, besides religion, it could be Papistical, he does not inform us ; but proceeds to assign his reasons for the assertion, among which the following are the chief. It despises ecclesias-

tical antiquity : it sets at naught received forms : it tampers with the mysteries of sacraments : it sets aside the privileges of baptism : it forms new associations for itself, instead of adhering to the organization of the Church : it magnifies the Scriptures, &c. Such are the premises from which he draws the conclusion, as to the growth of Popery. This gentleman must possess uncommon discernment, if he can discover what, I hesitate not to say, no one else can, any connexion between his premises and conclusion. If ever two things appeared hostile to each other, so utterly irreconcilable as to have run away from each other, these two things are this gentleman's premises and conclusion. Why, these are precisely the premises, which any man, less acute than Mr. Sewell, would have laid down for establishing the very opposite conclusion : viz. that, threatened though we be by Popery, its re-establishment among us would be a slow and difficult work. But while I dissolve the unnatural alliance between his premises and conclusion, I affirm the truth of his conclusion. Popery does threaten us, and is making inroads upon us, because such men as Mr. Sewell overrate "ecclesiastical antiquity;" would give us "received forms," and keep back the substance ; put "mysteries into the sacraments" which belong not to them ; would impose on us "a church organization" foreign from our establishment, and disparage "the Scriptures," and discourage their use !

I come now to Mr. Sewell's statement respecting the Church of Ireland, and the Irish clergy. It has happened to Mr. S. in this case, as it usually does to persons who write on subjects which they know little or nothing about, that he has made several mistakes. He says, "the energy of the Irish Church revived in 1824:" for the proof of this he refers to Dr. Doyle, (the celebrated Roman Catholic Bishop,) and to the Committee on Tithes. Dr. Doyle is certainly one of the last persons to whom we should feel disposed to refer for information as to the revival of religion in the Established Church. He knew a good deal about opposition to our Church : but as to the revival of religion in it, we should look for information elsewhere. Nor is it to the Committee on Tithes we should look for such information. There is no doubt a close connexion between tithes and the support of the clergy, and also between the abstraction of tithes and the starvation of the clergy, as many of the poor clergy are aware : but as to the connexion between tithes and the revival of religion in Ireland, this is a discovery for which we are indebted to Mr. Sewell. However, let this pass.

The revival of religion, which he assigns to the year 1824, commenced about twenty-eight years sooner, i. e. about the year 1796. About that time, several clergymen in various parts of Ireland, chiefly young men, recently ordained, exhibited zeal and earnestness in the discharge of their duties, combined

with considerable ability. Some of them had distinguished themselves in the University, and were Fellows of Dublin College. They had to encounter opposition and reproach. Those who were resident in Dublin were, almost immediately, in a quiet way, prevented from preaching in the parish churches. The effect of this was, that an episcopal chapel was opened, and, being connected with two important charities, which gave to it much popularity, the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Fowler) was deterred from meddling with it. After Dr. Fowler's death, the see of Dublin passed into the hands, successively, of three or four moderate and amiable prelates, who desired to do good. First, Dr. Cleaver, a conscientious and good man, succeeded to it. He, after no long time, was laid aside by indisposition, and his place supplied, first by Dr. Agar, a man of much good sense and kindness, who acted with great liberality, restoring to free access to the pulpits of the see, one of the clergymen (the only one who remained in Dublin) whom Dr. Fowler had inhibited. Next followed Archbishop Broderick, a man anxiously desirous to promote religion. Attempts were made by persons who possessed his confidence, to excite him to opposition to certain clergymen in his diocese, whose principles and zeal rendered them obnoxious. But his gentle spirit recoiled from the work of a persecutor. He was followed by Archbishop Magee, who did all that could be expected from a good man, of great

mental powers, to promote the cause of God. The episcopal chapel in Dublin, already referred to, was particularly favoured by Archbishop Magee, as he was aware of the signal service it had rendered to the cause of true religion, by leading, through the preaching of its ministers, the large numbers of the University students who flocked to it, to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and eventually, by the Divine blessing, to the knowledge of the Gospel, and to be able ministers of it.

In other parts of Ireland the revival of religion advanced at the same time, among both clergy and laity. In Limerick, several good clergymen laboured with success, and were kindly treated by Bishop Warburton. In Cork, excellent and devoted clergymen (among others the late revered Dr. Quarry) were the instruments of much good. In Kilkenny, the late venerable Bishop Hamilton, a man of distinguished talents as well as piety, gathered round him a body of faithful clergy, some of whom yet occupy the field of labour, while others have entered into rest. Among the latter are the two sons of the bishop, faithful and devoted ministers of the Gospel. Within the last few days, that diocese, and the church in Ireland, has suffered a severe loss in the death of the Rev. Peter Roe, who for more than forty years bore the burden and heat of the day. Thus the old champions of divine truth in Ireland are falling into the grave. But the great head of the Church, who gave them

their qualifications, and their success, can supply their place. In the north of Ireland,* a considerable body of clergymen, at an early period, took a part in this good work, and carried it forward with energy. The diocese of Tuam also enjoyed for many years the advantage and blessing of the superintendence of the late Archbishop Trench, a man whose praise is in all the churches. The numerous parishes of his diocese are filled by faithful ministers of the Gospel.

This revived energy of religion, as well as union among the clergy in whom it first appeared, was much advanced by means of several important institutions, which were originally established in Dublin, and afterwards spread themselves through the country. Among these, the first in point of time, as well as in importance and usefulness in Ireland, was the Hibernian Bible Society. It commenced in a meeting of so few persons, that one pew in a church held them. Among its earliest and most useful supporters were the late Dr. Stuart, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, and the present

* It was there my excellent friend and late colleague, the Rev. B. W. Mathias, entered on his clerical course. Though I have abstained from mentioning the names of living clergymen, his may be an exception, as, though still spared, his ministerial course is cut short by bodily infirmities. If my affection and respect for him allowed me to omit his name in such an enumeration, the omission would be supplied by the grateful recollections of hundreds of his brethren through Ireland. To how many of them has he been a spiritual father!!

Bishop of Kildare, Dr. Lindsay. To these two distinguished prelates, Ireland owes a large debt of gratitude. Other societies were also established, as the Church Missionary Society, the Sunday School Society, and various kindred institutions; some of which united Christians of various denominations; while others brought the clergy into contact; and thus knowledge increased, faith was confirmed, zeal enlivened, what was good, charitable, and useful, was advanced, and, by the divine blessing, the Church of Ireland was prepared for the trials and afflictions which awaited it.

Thus has this good work been advancing for more than forty years; and at this moment the Irish church presents a body of clergy, in all respects fitted for the arduous work committed to them; viz. amidst privations, and losses, and in the face of enemies, and in jeopardy of their lives, meekly and patiently to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

On this body of clergy Mr. Sewell has considered it becoming to sit in judgment. He has spent his youth at Oxford, and, as it would seem, acted there as tutor and professor of morals, up to the present time. What knowledge, or experience, or qualifications of any kind he possesses to fit him for the office he has assumed, we have no means of judging. He goes over to Ireland, posts through the country, listens to such gossip as those into whose houses he may obtain access choose to entertain

him with, partakes, perhaps, of the hospitality of the parish ministers, and then seats himself in formal judgment on the state and conduct of the Irish clergy, and pronounces the following oracular decision:—"In 1824, the energy of the church revived—"irregularly, violently at times, *injudiciously perhaps*,* certainly without adequate learning, but with a spirit of pure, self-devoted, and holy zeal, which those who know the Irish clergy of these recent times the best, will estimate the highest. Much that they did deserved censure, much required excuse." How could Mr. Sewell be guilty of the indiscretion (a much harsher word might, without impropriety, be used) of applying such language to this body of men, and to their conduct? He should have known, when he wrote it, that his praise carried with it neither credit nor advantage; and he must before this be aware that his censure is a calumny. Irregularity, violence, injudiciousness, much that deserved censure, much that required excuse! When was all this? Who ever heard of it before? Where is the record, or any authentic account of it? Who are the delinquents? What was their punishment? Or how did they escape censure? Mr. Sewell is an imaginative person, and this is all a romance; or, if it be

* Will Mr. S. be so obliging as to inform us how "acting irregularly and violently" can be otherwise than "acting injudiciously?" And does not the word "perhaps," appended to "injudiciously," make nonsense of his judicial sentence?

not, he can tell us his authority, and give some clue to the story. In the mean time, are these aggrieved, impoverished, excellent men, amidst the ruins of their fortunes and hopes, and surrounded by children whose prospects are blasted, to be exhibited to England as guilty of injudiciousness, irregularity, and violence ; or, in other words, as having brought upon themselves, and therefore deserved, the sufferings which they endure ? No. As in the face of England this censure was passed upon them, so now, in the face of England, it is pronounced a calumny.*

But this gentleman has a further accusation against the Irish clergy. “ The energy of the Irish church,” he informs us, “ was revived certainly without adequate learning.” I am disposed to think that Mr. Sewell has, by this time, discovered that there is quite learning enough among the Irish clergy to encounter him. He made this statement, as he has many others, in ignorance of the true state of the case. It is, he may be assured, an unfounded one. There is not one of those men to whom I

* One irregular course was adopted for a short time by those of the Irish clergy who belonged to what was called the “ Home Mission,” viz. that of going out of the bounds of their own parishes, to officiate, in the hope that the attraction of a stranger might cause the attendance of persons at divine worship and preaching, who were not accustomed to attend the ministrations of the parish clergyman. This was done from the best motives, and in ignorance of its irregularity. But as soon as the impropriety was judicially announced to them, they submitted, and gave up the practice.

have particularly alluded in the above enumeration, as more prominently engaged in the revival of the Irish church, who was not a competent scholar, as well as a sound divine. Mr. S., after making trial of any one of them, would have been as shy of continuing a discussion with him, as he has been of Dr. Miller. He has assumed the port and bearing of a learned man : and no doubt, so far as a knowledge of Latin and Greek goes towards making up such a character, he is a learned man. It would be impossible for one to be otherwise, whose employment is to hammer these languages into the hard heads of Oxford undergraduates. But in the proper sense of the word, a learned man is one who has acquired knowledge from the various accessible sources, and so arranged and digested it, and made himself master of it, as to be able to turn it to the wise and useful purposes of life generally, or of his own peculiar profession. If this be a just definition of a learned man, this gentleman must give us better evidence that he has deserved the character, than he has as yet furnished. Sure I am that his works furnish no evidence of his possessing the learning appropriate to a christian minister, that of being “MIGHTY IN THE SCRIPTURES!”

Finally. Mr. Sewell informs us, that “religious dissension meets us at every step in Ireland.” He certainly should have been an Irishman ; discord appears to be the element in which he delights.

Wherever he shows himself, it is in conflict. In his Christian Morals, he strikes right and left at all denominations, Protestant and Roman Catholic. In the Irish journals, he assails Dr. Miller, and continues the battle until driven out out of the field. He then, rather than be idle, turns on Mr. Newman, and in a letter to Dr. Pusey attacks him, giving Dr. Pusey himself a hit or two as he passes ; and then, in a second letter, which he calls a Postscript, he strikes at the heads of the university. These are, however, trifling battles. Longing for warfare on a larger scale, he crosses the Channel, and chooses poor Ireland for his battle-field. There, a warrior fully equipped, he attacks the Dissenters and the Roman Catholics, and, lest combatants should fail him, he strikes at the clergy of his own church. He has repeated his attacks, and yet, far from being satisfied, he is, at this moment, charging another great gun, by the explosion of which we shall presently be stunned. His *office* is that of a minister of peace. But is he not, in reality, a MIGHTY MAN OF WAR?

It would be inexcusable to withhold from the public the happy epithet by which a distinguished Irish prelate has designated the system of the Oxford Tract writers ; viz. NEWMAN-IA.

A P P E N D I X.

It may be interesting to those who are acquainted with Mr. Alexander Knox's writings, to know the facts above alluded to. About five years ago, a gentleman with whom I have been in habits of friendship from my youth, and who was also a friend of Mr. Knox, being in London, communicated to me certain conversations which he had with Mr. Knox shortly before his death, which indicated a change in that gentleman's religious views and principles. I was much struck with the circumstances which he related, and, knowing what extensive mischief Mr. Knox's writings had produced, and were daily producing, in this country, I saw at once the importance of putting the public in possession of the fact that his unscriptural doctrines had failed him in the hour of trial, and that he had been obliged to abandon them; and that, by God's grace, he had sought peace in the principles which he had so long despised. I pointed this out to my friend, and as he informed me that he had taken notes of the conversations, and still possessed them, I urged on him the duty of giving them immediate pub-

licity. After some hesitation and difficulty, arising from an unwillingness to do what might be unacceptable to certain parties, he promised to consider the matter on his return to Ireland. Accordingly, in the course of a few days, I received from him the annexed letter, addressed to the Editor of the *Christian Observer*, and his permission to make use of it or not, as I might think proper. I sent it, forthwith, to the press.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

On reading your review, last year, of the correspondence between Mr. Knox and the Bishop of Limerick, I had prepared a letter, relative to some interesting circumstances connected with the closing scene of Mr. Knox's life, which it was my intention at that time to send to you, with a view, if you had approved of it, to its publication in your valuable work. Upon reflection, I began to doubt whether I was called upon to put myself forward on the occasion, and for the time I abandoned the idea of doing so. I have since been conversing with one or two judicious friends on the subject of the publication referred to above; and having communicated to them the particulars of what had occurred, to my knowledge, during Mr. Knox's last illness, they were of opinion that I ought, on various accounts, to make those particulars public. Their recommendation has determined me to send this letter, and to leave to your judgment whether the publication of it be expedient or otherwise.

For above thirty years I enjoyed a personal intimacy with Mr. Knox, and had frequent opportunities of conversing with him, in the most unreserved way, on religious subjects. Our conversations on certain points were always of a *polemical* nature; but our warfare was conducted, cer-

tainly on his part, and I hope I may say with truth on mine, without any symptom of asperity. Feeling, as I did, my own intellectual inferiority to Mr. Knox, I considered his spending his time conversing with me, as, on his part, an act of condescension; and his mode of conducting a controversy, so far as my experience went, gave his opponent no excuse for becoming intemperate. He never interrupted me: he always, whenever I said anything that he thought worthy of attention, admitted its title; and he proceeded to answer me with calmness and with candour. My friend Mr. Knox has, by his published letters, given evidence to the world that he was a man of no ordinary mind. But his mental powers are not to be judged of by what he has written. Mr. Knox's superiority to other men appeared not so much in what he wrote, as in what he spoke. You might find many better writers than Mr. Knox—many at least as good—but you would find it difficult to produce a man who had the same talent for conversation.

Almost all my communications with Mr. Knox related to religious subjects. His views on some of the most important points differed materially from mine; and my object was to show him, if I could, the insecurity which belonged to the foundation of his religious scheme. What his scheme was, may be known by a reference to his printed letters. As to myself, I felt that if Christ was not, in the proper sense, a victim; if his death had not a propitiatory character; if justification were not free; if these things were not so, I say, I felt myself without any ground to stand upon. These subjects, and the points connected with them, were the matter of discussion between us; but, often as we discussed them, we continued to differ in our views respecting them, till a short time before the death

of my valued friend ; and this brings me to the immediate subject of the present communication.

Having been in the constant habit of visiting Mr. Knox in his house in Dublin, I went to him one day, according to my usual custom, and found him very unwell. This was about three months before his death. After the accustomed salutations, he said, " Sit you down, my dear Mr. Kelly : I am very glad to see you." To my inquiries respecting his health, his answer was, " Very poorly ; but this is not what I have most to complain of. My mind, I will confess to you, is not happy." Here he paused ; and I remained silent, in order to give him an opportunity of explaining himself, if he wished it. After a short interval he said, " I begin, dear Mr. Kelly, to suspect that my views have not been *sufficiently evangelical* ; and I am disposed to trace the present depression of my mind to that cause." The employment of the term " evangelical," by my friend Mr. Knox, on the occasion referred to, showed me at once that a very interesting change had taken place in his mind, relating to the points upon which he and I had been from time to time conversing. The expression " sufficiently evangelical," wrung from him under the circumstances of the case, imported much more, and was intended to do so, than their strict interpretation would have warranted. I considered it as intended to impart to me the fact that his mind had undergone a change on the subjects on which we had formerly differed ; that his former principles were not able to sustain him in a nearer prospect of death and eternity ; and that it was to more *evangelical views* he was now disposed to look for effectual support, when the great trial of his faith should come. That my interpretation of his words was a just one, our subsequent conversation proved to my entire satisfaction ; and

had I still entertained any doubt on that subject, that doubt must have been removed by an interesting circumstance that occurred before the conclusion of our interview. When I was about to take my leave, Mr. Knox stopped me. "Before you go," he said, "my dear Mr. Kelly, you must offer up a prayer for me." He then conducted me into a private apartment, where we knelt down together, and where I prayed in conformity with the principles which sustained my own mind, and which I believed were becoming dear to my valued and beloved friend. After I had finished, "Thank you," he said, "my dear Mr. Kelly, thank you." It is not to be supposed that Mr. Knox's calling on me to pray in this way, was an insignificant circumstance. This is far from being the case. It was a very significant token of a state of mind quite different from his former one, in respect to the matters on which we had been in the habit of conversing. Mr. Knox had never on any former occasion proposed that we should pray together. Indeed, I do not think that he would have liked it, if it had been proposed by me. He had his own views on this subject—views which I believe led him rather to disapprove of prayer offered in this way. Be this, however, as it may, it is certain that this was the first time that Mr. Knox ever proposed such a thing to me; and I feel myself fully justified in regarding it as among the evidences of that change which his mind had undergone, on the subjects of our previous communications.

Some time after the visit mentioned above, I paid him another, and had the satisfaction of finding my former conclusions, as I conceived, fully verified. After this second visit I left town, and on my return I found that my valued friend was dead. What took place after my departure till his death, I do not know; nor was I able to find out. I

have simply stated the facts of which I had a personal cognisance, and given the inference that I considered myself entitled to draw from those facts—namely, that Mr. Knox had found his theories, however ingenious, to fail him in the time of need ; and that he had seen it necessary to become as a little child, and in all simplicity to embrace the testimony of the Gospel, as to the *necessity* and the *sufficiency* of Christ's *vicarious* work, to relieve the conscience and support the sinner in the near prospect of death and eternity.

Before I conclude, I wish to say a word as to what I would not be understood to mean. In the first place, then, I do not mean to attribute, in any sense, the change in my friend Mr. Knox's views to the conversations that he and I had upon these subjects. Mr. Knox was well informed on all these points, and had been in the earlier part of his life *more evangelical* than he was in that period during which he wrote his published letters. The change arose, I should rather think, from the blessing of God upon his own reflections, and the effect produced upon his mind by a consciousness of increasing bodily infirmity, as indicating the approach of that day, when “ wood, hay, and stubble ” would be consumed, and nothing but “ gold, silver, and precious stones ” would abide the test.

In the next place, I wish to observe, that I do not mean to say that my friend Mr. Knox made any FORMAL retraction of his former views. I never required this from him. It was enough for me to be satisfied, as I thought I had reason to be, of the reality of the change in question, and to be able to thank God for the blessing thus imparted to one whom I always loved, and who, in the state in which I found him at this period, both as to mind and body, had become to me an object of greatly increased interest.

Lastly, not having seen my friend Mr. Knox for some weeks before his death, as stated above, I cannot pretend to say what might have occurred to weaken the force of the conclusions which I draw from the conversations which I had with him previous to my departure from town. I am only accountable for the truth of what I have stated, which I am quite willing to be: *valeat quantum valere potest*. From the facts in question, I considered myself fully justified in making the inference which I did make; and I confess it would much surprise me if any subsequent fact should render that inference questionable.

You, sir, must judge whether this letter is of sufficient importance to be entitled to a place in a publication, the contributions to which are, I believe, very abundant and interesting. Should you decide against its admission, I shall acquiesce in your judgment, in full assurance that you will have determined rightly.

I am, sir, very sincerely yours,

Dublin.

THOMAS KELLY.

This letter drew forth contradictions from several quarters, as might have been expected, and as, indeed, had been anticipated by Mr. Kelly. Such contradictions, however, only served to establish the fact set forth by that gentleman, four other persons having come forward and communicated the most satisfactory information of a similar description, viz. conversations with Mr. Knox, to the same effect as those above mentioned. All these persons are intelligent, and of unimpeachable credibility. One of them is a gentleman of distinguished ability and excellence, whose name, if he permitted the use of it, would stop all controversy on the subject. Mr. Kelly's own authority leaves no doubt on the minds of those acquainted with his piety and con-

scientiousness. As Mr. Kelly is not so well known here as in Ireland, it may be proper to state, that he is the only son of the late Right Hon. Thomas Kelly, an Irish judge. He is a distinguished scholar, and universally respected in Ireland.







